DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 178 744	CE 023 098

AUTHOR	Hoyt, Kenneth: And Others
TITLE	LEA/CETA: Collaboration for Career Education. (A Series of Fifteen Mini-Conferences.)
INSTITUTION	Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	[79]
CONTRACT	300-78-0057
NOTE	378p.; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel; Agency Role; Career Education; Conference Reports; Employment Problems; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Government School Relationship; Group Discussion; High School Students; *Interagency Cooperation; *Job Training; Out of School Youth; *Problem Solving; *School Community Cooperation; School Districts; State Agencies; *Youth Employment; Youth Problems; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Local Education Agencies

ABSTRACT

The series of fifteen mini-conferences reported here involved local education agency (LEA) and Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) representatives from a sample of communities in examination of LEA/CETA collaboration. This report gives the results--what transpired--as noted by the conferences' conductor, Kenneth Hoyt, in the form of reconstructed questions and answers, main points of discussion, and capsule accounts of how the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreement (as mandated by the Youth Employment Training Program [YETP] of CETA) was working in the respective community. A list of issues raised by the participants is included in the report, while each conference report gives the few major concerns from the participants' own lists that were actually discussed and what was done about them--concerns such as how to avoid duplication of services, or how to arrange for academic credit for YETP participants, or how to help educators learn what they need to know about CETA. Hoyt notes that (1) there are common threads of concerns; (2) there are no basic problems raised to which multiple solutions had not already been found by some set of communities; and (3) it is amazing how rapidly and well communities made the LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements work. (CP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED178744

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEA/CETA

Collaboration for Career Education
(A Series of Fifteen Mini-Conferences)

Dr. Kenneth Hoyt talks with
Educators and CETA staff

PREPARED FOR

Office of Career Education
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Contract No. 300-78-0057

Washington, D.C.

CE 023 098

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318, states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, career education projects supported under Sections 402 and 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

DISCLAIMER

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a grant or contract from the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, points of view or opinions expressed do not necessarily represent policies or positions of the Office of Education.

PREFACE

The law creating the Youth Employment Training Program (YETP) portion of CETA stipulates that YETP activities be coordinated with those occurring under provisions of P.L. 95-207 -- The Career Education Incentive Act. The CETA legislation itself is not specific regarding either the nature or the methods involved in such "coordination." The most direct clues are to be found in examining both the YETP legislation and the career education legislation. Those making this kind of study will quickly discover large areas of similar concerns. Generically, such concerns center around challenges facing those who are interested in and concerned about better preparing youth for work through providing them with a set of general employability skills that will allow them to change with change in the occupational society. Coupled with this is a companion concern centered around problems of helping youth engage in the process of self exploration and career exploration. These kinds of similarities become most obvious when one examines the YETP requirement that a minimum of 22 percent of YETP funds be used for purposes of "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements" between local school districts and CETA Prime Sponsors.

Given this broad framework, literally hundreds of communities began, in early 1978, to enter into such "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements." In most communities, neither the CETA Prime Sponsor representatives nor the educators had a very clear conceptual idea of what to do or how to do it. Still, they did begin. The notes found in this publication contain descriptions of such early efforts -- including both the problems encountered and the solutions discovered.

The background for these notes is straightforward. In late 1978, OE's Office of Career Education entered into a contract with Kirschner Associates to: (a) identify exemplary communities where "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements" were in operation; (b) conduct a series of "mini-conferences" involving both CETA and LEA representatives from a sample of such exemplary communities; and (c) conduct a series of regional conferences aimed at sharing some of what was learned in the "miniconferences" with others. The notes found in this publication report the results of the second of these three steps -- i.e., an account of what transpired in the "miniconferences" themselves. These notes are ones that I took personally while conducting each of the 15 "miniconferences" in this series. They have been corrected only by those participants who chose to add, delete, or correct material from my rough notes.

Readers will note that each of the 15 sets of notes found here carries a special title referring to one possible emphasis that, under the YETP legislation, might be found in an "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement." An attempt was made, in inviting miniconference participants, to call together 10 persons -- 5 representing CETA Prime Sponsors and 5 representing LEAs -- from five different communities, each of which was reported to be using some particular "variation" in its agreement. Those who study these notes carefully will quickly discover that, while this procedure usually resulted in a certain degree of commonality of concern among participants, such was not always the case. Variability, rather than commonality, was more nearly the general rule.

At each "miniconference," participants began by identifying what they regarded as the basic issues, problems, and concerns they feel exist with respect to forming and implementing an "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement" under YETP. The list of such concerns from each "miniconference" is found in these notes. Those who find time only to study these 15 lists of concerns will discover much "food for thought." Following this, each set of participants identified, from the list they had generated, those issues, problems, and concerns which they, as a group, felt deserved priority. The "priority concerns" were then discussed at some length; they form a major part of the notes found here. In addition to these, each set of community representatives was asked to give a capsule picture or how its "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement" actually works. Those "capsule pictures" form a second important part of these notes.

No pretense is made here that the 70 communities -- and 135 participants -- represented in these notes depict the "best" LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements in the nation. Certainly, many better ones must surely be in existence somewhere. What is claimed here is that these 70 communities do represent 70 "success stories" where CETA Prime Sponsor persons and local educators have learned to respect each other, to learn from each other, and to work together in constructive ways that are providing significant benefits to youth.

As the person responsible for conducting these "miniconferences" and for taking the notes found here, I believe that the following generalizations can properly be drawn from the notes found in this document: (a) there are a number of common threads -- I identified 28 in the total of 514 issues -- of concerns being expressed by these participants, each of which deserves careful study; (b) there was no basic problem raised by participants to which multiple solutions had not already been found by some set of communities; (c) the 70 communities represented in these notes do, in fact, represent 70 "success stories" deserving of careful study by those who are suspicious or distrustful of CETA/LEA relationships -- i.e., they have demonstrated that the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement concept can work and is working in some communities; (d) there are no discernible differences between CETA representatives and local educators, either in the concerns they voice or in the true professional commitment they have to helping youth; and (e) the most amazing lesson to be learned by those who study these notes carefully is how well -- and how rapidly -- these communities have made the concept of the "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement" work -- not in looking at continuing difficulties being faced.

These notes are being distributed now, in their current rough form, simply because we feel it is important to share them with others. I have every intention of writing a series of monographs based on these notes, each of which will be centered around a common theme of concern. When that set of monographs is produced, I believe the tremendous professional contributions made by the 135 participants in these "miniconferences" will be even more apparent. I have learned a very great deal from them. I hope this set of notes serves as a vehicle for you to use in also benefiting from their wisdom and their experiences. They are not just "problem raisers" -- they are also "solution makers." We need more like them.

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
United States Office of Education

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 116

Strong Elements of Career Information, Counseling, Guidance, and Placement

March 6 and 7, 1979

Participants

Mr. Don Parsons, Director
Vocational Education Program
Educational Services
Flagstaff, Arizona

Mr. Polo M. Rivera
Education Program Specialist
Adult Vocational Services
Arizona Department of Education
Phoenix, Arizona

Mr. Willie Horsely
Program Supervisor
Kansas City Public Schools
Kansas City, Missouri

Mr. Gary Gortenburg
Youth Employment Coordinator
Urban Affairs Department
Employment and Training Division
Kansas City, Missouri

Ms. Florence Brady
Counselor/Career Consultant
Haddon Township High School
Westmont, New Jersey

Mr. Stephen M. Lynch
Assistant Director
Employment and Training Center
of Camden County (CETA)
Stratford, New Jersey

Mr. Bill Silva, Program Coordinator
Tourism/Hospitality and Education/
Day Care Programs
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Mr. Jay Czar
Manpower Planner
City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo Co.
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Mr. C. C. Davis, Superintendent
Gadsden City Schools
Gadsden, Alabama

Observers

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D. C.

Ms. Janet F. Carroll
CETA Specialist
State Department of Education
Providence, Rhode Island

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to communicate philosophy between CETA Prime Sponsors and educators.

2. How to keep the politics out of the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement to the point where youth are adversely affected.

3. How to coordinate the YETP program within the school system.

4. How to develop in educators an understanding and acceptance of the purposes of YETP.

5. How to build broader community understanding regarding the nature and purposes of YETP.

6. How to be flexible in making LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements, without destroying the integrity of the planned YETP program.

7. How to make LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements clear and specific so that we know what is to be done and who is responsible.

8. How to keep lines of authority clear and workable.

9. How to resolve operational conflicts when they occur.

10. How to overcome the resistance of LEAs to granting academic credit for YETP.

11. How to solve the red tape problems in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

12. How to solve the "22 percent problem" in YETP.

13. How to work with multiple school districts from a single Prime Sponsor.

14. How to keep within the CETA regulations and still provide some flexibility to schools.

15. How to keep the prime emphasis of YETP on the economically disadvantaged.

16. How to handle the obvious differences in background of CETA and school personnel.

17. How to operate a YETP program with the necessary annual need for refunding.

18. How to offer YETP transition services to small numbers of youth with limited funds.

19. How to resolve CETA funding cycles within the school year schedule.

20. How to avoid duplication of services.

21. How to overcome fear of LEAs from having "outsiders" come into the school.

22. How to resolve SEA Fiscal Years with Department of Labor Fiscal Years.

23. How to resolve school budget preparation schedules with CETA minimum wage requirements.

24. How to best accomplish joint planning between school districts and CETA.

25. How to resolve terminology problems between vocational educational and CETA.

26. How to hire school personnel for YETP after the school year has begun.

27. How to keep clear distinctions between YETP and the various kinds of regular school program.

28. How to tie YETP with previous on-going CETA school programs.

29. How to handle the salary schedule problems of school districts vs. CETA.

30. How to make YETP mean more than Public Service Employment.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Gary Gortenberg and Willie Horsely - Kansas City, Missouri

Willie (LEA representative)

In establishing our working relationships, we started with the contract agreement. We wrote a proposal to our Prime Sponsor saying specifically what we wanted to do with our 95 YETP-eligible youth. Since we are in the vocational education department, we thought about doing it from the standpoint of: (a) career education; (b) career exploration; and (c) job placement. We started with career education (job awareness) -- i.e., attitudes toward work, how to find/get/hold a job, how to write a job resume, etc. We took longer on this phase than we had originally planned, but it was well worth it. The emphasis on good work habits gave these youth benefits they can use all their lives.

In our career exploration phase, we used three basic training modules: (a) small engine repair, (b) foods, and (c) building maintenance repair. All youth, in each of these exploratory programs, pick up some basic work skills and a knowledge of what it is like to be successfully employed. We also place youth on nonprofit job sites on a rotating basis in this portion of our program. As a preliminary activity, each youth goes through our VOCATIONAL EVALUATION CENTER for three to four days. Following this, we place each one in an appropriate training/job slot. It is not easy to do, but it is possible.

We have a full-time project director and a secretary. Other persons are part-time teachers, each of whom is responsible for teaching (a) job readiness and (b) one kind of career exploratory activity PLUS counseling of youth. There are six staff persons in all.

Most of our job slots now are within the school system. We are starting to move to some jobs in out-of-school settings.

By being in the vocational education department, it has been easy for us to implement the YETP program. We have several mobile trailer units which we use in our YETP program (which is primarily an after-school program). Our career exploration units are placed in these mobile vans. Our Vocational Evaluation Center is located at our vocational-technical center, and it contains many kinds of vocational evaluation instruments (including some homemade ones) that are useful to us. We are planning a followup of our efforts this coming summer.

Gary (Prime Sponsor representative)

Total YETP enrollment in Kansas City area is 310 -- 95 of whom are in the particular program Willie just described. One hundred-eighty of these youth are served by the Prime Sponsor directly in an in-school program, and the remainder are served in various community action agencies. All of these have a traditional work experience approach, with a special seminar on "job searching" about once a month.

One of the reasons we have gone to this arrangement is that last year we tried operating an in-school program with cooperative CETA/LEA staff. It did not work well, primarily because of salary differences apparent to all, plus related "turf" problems.

Our Youth Council is not very active. Its members put a lot of faith in our CETA staff persons. We have not over-ridden them in any area they have recommended to us.

I have had no contact with our State Employment Training Council. My only contact with the SEA has been with reference to academic credit; that was so discouraging that we are not even considering granting academic credit.

Our direct YETP program for the 180 students has already begun to pay off in terms of the fact that a number of them have made self placements on jobs -- far more than we thought would be possible. Our relationships with our Employment Service people have been excellent. Further cooperation has been obtained from the University of Missouri Extension Service (which has made its career education module available to us for use). There are six CETA staff persons operating this program.

In terms of LEA relationships, we have found some counselors and principals willing to work with us while others are not. We begin each year by meeting with all the superintendents in our school districts. They have been very cooperative. We cannot "buy into" the regular counselor system in Kansas City because salaries are too high there.

Questions and Answers

Q - Is your in-school YETP program located in your vocational education center?
A - No, our vocational evaluation center is.

Q - Is your 95 student YETP effort primarily an after-school affair?
A - Yes. There are two reasons for this: (a) availability of staff and (b) space.

Q - Are youth paid for their career orientation experiences as well as for their work experiences in your YETP program?
A - Yes, ten hours per week at the minimum wage.

Q - Did your school district buy the mobile units you are using?
A - No, the SEA bought them for use in our disadvantaged and handicapped program. Thus, they were simply available to us for use in the YETP program.

Q - Are you planning to compare the "95 student effort" with the "180 student effort"?

A - Yes, we will use job retention and termination rate as criteria. There is no good formal evaluation tool available. We do not know if we will continue with both of these programs next year; we may choose only one of them.

Q - Is there a cost the school district would have to pay, in your 95 student effort, if the YETP funds disappeared?

A - Only the cost of the YETP Coordinator (assuming we stop paying stipends to students).

Polo Rivera and Don Parsons - Phoenix, Arizona

Polo (Prime Sponsor representative)

I am a liaison between adult vocational educational services and the SEA under a variety of arrangements including:

- Direct contracts with three of our six local school districts
- Contracts with the county superintendent who, in turn, works with the school district
- Contracts with a consortium which works with a number of school districts
- Contracts with two or more school districts which form a consortium, with one of them acting as fiscal agent
- Contract with a career education coordinator to work with school districts under an "umbrella contract" arrangement

We also work with some of our community colleges and some four year colleges in order to expand our community resources for YETP.

We are now putting together a "TRANSITION SERVICES HANDBOOK" containing actual examples of how various LEAs are operating under YETP. We use the six percent vocational education money for use in conducting training workshops for YETP.

Don (LEA representative)

I serve as Career Education Director of six school districts (among my other jobs). Through career education, we employ people to coordinate the YETP program. We buy their time with State career education money, with CETA money, vocational money, and combinations of all of these. My project is governed by a board of education whose members are superintendents of the school districts. I also have a Business/ Industry Advisory Committee. I implement YETP through the career education staff as an extension of the regular career education effort. We also tie YETP into our cooperative work study program. This year, only three of our 33 YETP youth are CETA-eligible; thus, 30 have to be placed in work-study with private employers. We can now certify YETP participants by phone; the youth talks on the phone with the CETA Prime Sponsor staff person. One of our biggest problems is offering YETP "transition services" in small schools each of which has only a few YETP eligible youth; so, we offer primarily the work experience portion of YETP.

Questions and Answers

Q - How do you see YETP relating to the total career education effort?

A - To me, "career education" is synonomous with "education." YETP is simply an extension of the cooperative work-study program. In each cooperative program, there is a related class that does the "career awareness" type things. LEAs were very reluctant to become involved with CETA in any way. By tying it back through the SEA, LEAs felt it had some credibility. They accepted it last year on a trial basis; now they have opened up to the point where they will accept other CETA programs in addition to YETP.

Q - Would you advise the Federal government to put YETP Coordinators in all SEAs whose prime job would be one of selling LEAs on YETP?

A - No. If such a position were created, it ought to extend beyond YETP to include all of CETA.

Q - How often do Polo and Don get together?

A - At least once a month -- plus frequent phone calls.

Q - Why can't you do YETP "transition services" easily with rural youth?

A - With only four or five eligible youth in one school, it is hard to set up a special class just for them.

Bill Silva and Jay Czar - Albuquerque, New Mexico

Jay (Prime Sponsor representative)

Albuquerque/Bernalillo County's population is 400,000 persons -- about one-third of New Mexico's population. There are only two CETA Prime Sponsors in New Mexico: one in Albuquerque/Bernalillo County (where Albuquerque is located), and one for Balance of State. We have $20 million funding for CETA, of which about $3.5 million goes to LEAs for a variety of kinds of CETA programs (including YETP). The Albuquerque school district has a CETA Title II-C, a Title VI, a Title II-D, a Title IV YIEP (Tier 2), a YCCIP, and a YETP program. It also has 90 percent of our SPEDY program.

Our relationship with the Albuquerque schools has evolved since 1965. They have received almost all of our youth funding. Albuquerque was one of the three model projects under the original CETA effort in 1971. The Department of Labor staff person sent to Albuquerque at that time to provide us with technical assistance is now Mayor of Albuquerque. Our CETA Planning Board has always involved members of our school system.

When YEDPA came about, the only thing it did was formalize our already good working relationships. It did not change them. There are several CETA staff persons on the staff of the LEA's Federal Program Director; some of them are former CETA participants. It works well.

In terms of the Prime Sponsor structure, there is a Youth Division Manager who reports to the Director. Under him is a "Federal Programs Supervisor" who acts as CETA liaison with the school system.

Bill (LEA representative)

Overall YETP objectives include:

- To provide meaningful training programs for economically disadvantaged youth
- To provide youth with insights into possible occupational goals
- To provide youth with good work habits and employability skills

There are two major components in our YETP effort:

- Tourism and Hospitality Program

  We select 30 economically disadvantaged juniors and seniors each semester from a total of 11 high schools.

  Through an 18-week program (including three weeks of classroom orientation to job seeking/getting/ holding skills and an introduction to the field of hotel training), we provide 15 weeks of training -- three weeks each in five areas. This amounts to 90 hours of classroom instruction plus 225 hours of technical training. The youth receive one semester hour credit for this.

  Having started in February, 1977, with an objective of placing students in unsubsidized employment, we have placed 84 percent of them.

- Day Care Program - started in October, 1978

  Provides training in child care PLUS free child care for families.

  Provides 1 1/2 credits to juniors and seniors as Child Care Aides.

  In addition, we have 10 out-of-school youth participating as para-professionals, who are being trained in child care.

  We also have 46 high school youth participating as observers who are not formally connected with this YETP program.

  The children cared for in this center are those of teen age parents, of CETA trainees, and others. It is a very good service but, of course, will not show up anywhere as "YETP credit."

Staffing - We have one coordinator, one counselor, one home economics teacher, and two teachers at the day care center. Since we use new teachers, there is a lot of turnover of staff (seeking more secure positions).

Questions and Answers

Q - Are your 10 para-professionals included in your 22 percent YETP funds?
A - No. They are paid for by the "78 percent money."

Q - How many hours do enrollees spend in hotel training?
A - 15 hours per week paid at the minimum wage.

Q - Are unions complaining about students being employed in the hotel program?
A - No. These are all "training slots"; we do not displace any workers.

Q - How do you justify channeling YETP youth into "hospitality careers" rather than offering them broader career exploration opportunities?
A - This is a very small component of our overall youth program. It involves only 50 youth out of the 4,400 youth we serve. We have a head counselor contact at each of the 10 high schools who helps us publicize this program.

Q - How do you avoid slotting students?
A - We emphasize job seeking/getting/holding skills in ALL of our youth programs -- independent of any specific vocational skill training we give. Thus, our youth are adaptable when they finish.

Florence Brady and Steve Lynch - Stratford, New Jersey

Steve (Prime Sponsor representative)

Camden County is, in effect, a Philadelphia suburb.

Our activity is called Experience Based Career Education (EBCE). We use the RBS Model of EBCE. The basic outlines of our program were started in 1971 when EBCE started. This is one reason we have been successful.

Economically disadvantaged 10th, 11th, and 12th graders from three high schools spend one half-day in this program five days per week. They job sample occupations for three half-days per week and are rotated through 15 clusters in one year.

We made a policy decision to put the students through all 15 clusters in one year. After this, they can choose 10 additional clusters themselves for more career exploration.

During two half-days per week, students are in a group guidance class whose purpose is to answer career exploration questions growing out of the work experience. In addition, the class includes teaching job seeking/ getting/holding skills. An added value is the opportunity for each youth to listen to others who have had experience in different occupations.

In the CETA regulations, career exploration is discussed in more detail than any other single topic. We placed three of our youth in public sector and two or three in private sector career exploration slots.

The program in each of the three schools differs. In one school, students have access to a career exploration/guidance/academic resource center. In a second school, students are in EBCE 5 1/2 hours per week throughout the school year. In the third school, EBCE is only 12 weeks of 1/2 day per week. Each student is paid a training wage for 10 hours per week. In one school, regular school staff are assigned to work with us. In the other two schools, a CETA employee is out-stationed in the school and regarded by the school as a school employee. The schools have good linkages with each other. The three Program Directors meet together and work together; they also share the exploration sites with each other. These programs are also linked with the CETA operation. One of our CETA vocational counselors is assigned to these three programs.

We started with seniors only but found that this caused unnecessary competition with cooperative education, so we have moved the program back to the sophomore/junior level. By doing this, we: (a) enrolled more cooperative education students (as seniors) and (b) provided more work sites for cooperative education -- thus making them our friends.

Florence (LEA representative)

The Project Director for YETP (paid for by CETA) is a certified counselor. She works well with the regular counselors in our school and is housed there and considered as an adjunct to existing services. She has responsibility for identifying YETP-eligible youth.

Evaluative criteria are still being discussed. Of our 34 work sites, ALL are still with us. Almost all the YETP youth who started are still in the program.

We have no problems awarding academic credit. We do so on the same basis as any other work study program.

Our YETP effort is career exploration based, NOT work based. Therefore, it is a natural first step in the whole work exploration and eventual job placement process from the experience based aspect.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you call your program "transition services" or "work experience"?
A - We call it "transition," meaning we pay training allowances, not wages.

Q - If there were a progressive wage or allowance (as in distributive education) whereby, as youth move from career awareness to exploration to work experience, they could get paid more, would it help sell it to employers or to schools?
A - No. The schools like the fact that we are paying all students allowances.

Q - High school dropouts are highest in Grade Ten. What are you doing to reach students before that point?
A - We cannot help youth below age 16.

C. C. Davis - Gadsden, Alabama

C.C. (LEA representative)

The best aspect of our program is the excellent coordination existing among agencies.

There are three school systems: (a) the county system; (b) the Gadsden inner city system; and (c) one more system. I am in the Gadsden inner city system.

We have experienced the typical inner city problem of white flight to the suburbs. We are trying to coordinate career education, vocational education, and the academic disciplines. The entire curriculum has been re-written to include career education. We have re-written vocational education to tie it in more closely with basic academic disciplines.

We have also tried to coordinate YETP with career education, but there are some difficulties. These stem from the old philosophical arguments about whether kids should be: (a) assigned to jobs; or (b) helped in career decision making.

Our teachers have become very involved with career education -- and thus in YETP. We decided that, after we identified the YETP students, we would look for jobs to assign them. Initially, people said we could not do it because not enough jobs would be available. We answered by saying that, if you are creative enough in using the community resources -- as well as the school curriculum -- you CAN find career exploration opportunities for almost any occupation in which a student may express interest. WE HAVE DEMONSTRATED THAT WE CAN DO THIS.

We have TV videotapes of careers in our local industries showing the entire process of going from raw material to finished product - with all the various occupations involved. We can use these videotapes in classrooms instead of taking all youth on frequent field trips.

We concentrate on tying work experience into career exploration.

Questions and Answers

Q - How do you pay for the videotapes?
A - We allocate regular school funds for these.

Q - What are you using your YETP money for?
A - We pay the students for work experience plus the salary of the YETP Coordinator.

Q - Do you feel there is a spin-off in helping educators learn more about the world of work as they seek to create career exploration/work experience opportunities for their students?
A - Yes. It has made every teacher become a counselor.

Q - What is different about your YETP program -- as opposed to your career education program -- other than the fact that your YETP youth are paid for career exploration?

A - Our regular career education program concentrates on infusion within the classrooms. With the YETP funds, we have been able to ADD a component of hands-on-career exploration in the business/industry community.

FOUR ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to build understanding and acceptance among educators of the purposes of YETP.
- How to resolve CETA funding cycles within the school year schedule.
- How to avoid duplication of services.
- How to keep the prime emphasis of YETP on the economically disadvantaged.

Issue: How to build understanding and acceptance among educators of the purposes of YETP

Florence: The Project Director of our YETP program is a CETA employee, not a school employee. The program was brought in during the summer when many school people were not around. However, since it sounded like a good program, the counseling staff from our school came in during the summer to help identify the CETA-eligible youth. The potential of the problem is that, if we did not understand YETP, it would have been difficult to communicate to students, community, and work-study program coordinators in our district so that they understand that YETP is a career exploration effort -- not just another kind of work-study that supplements the existing curriculum and does not necessarily replace it.

C.C.: It is closely related to the "22 percent problem." How many school people knew about the 22 percent before it was too late?

Don: Too often, we try to identify YETP as a "CETA program" rather than as a "school district" program -- *i.e.*, YETP should be considered as simply an extension of the regular school program.

Willie: The issue is how to inform persons within the school district about the program. Should we send out brochures, make speeches, or what?

Don: There is an implementation process for any new program in a school district. The implementation of YETP should follow that regular process.

Willie: DISAGREE. Regular programs are approved by the Board of Education with major public announcements. YETP is too small to receive such a large public announcement.

Jay: AGREE WITH WILLIE. YETP is not like "any other program." CETA has traditionally had a bad public press, and YETP gets caught in this. We have put youth to work during the summer before, but that is quite different from YETP, which seeks to find its way into the school curriculum.

Florence: YETP was viewed in our district as something that added a positive dimension to our total school offerings. Without YETP, many of these YETP-eligible kids would have dropped out of high school. Now, without the necessity of committing themselves to a particular occupational choice, they have a chance to explore careers, and, as a result, stay motivated to remain in school.

Don: Maybe we have to count on the SEAs to bring YETP into the schools. If this were to happen, maybe LEAs would regard it as a "school program" rather than as a "Department of Labor program."

Janet: AGREE. We have an SEA person (paid by CETA funds) to go from school to school to talk to LEAs about CETA. We have, for example, a film showing SPEDY success stories for the purpose of building a positive image of CETA among educators. The problem, at the SEA level, is that SEA personnel who should be working together on CETA-type problems tend not to talk to each other.

C.C.: When you get down to implementing CETA, you find resistance from, for example, distributive education (D.E.) teachers; they see YETP as competing with them for the same students. This competition should be stopped. We need some objectives from the Federal Government in terms of what we are trying to accomplish through YETP.

Jay: In one of our programs, we wanted to deal with private employers. This immediately threatened distributive education instructors.

C.C.: You see competition from math and science teachers too. They say "We are preparing kids to make a living but CETA is paying them before we have them prepared, thus undermining our efforts."

Don: The regular school program is for those students who can make it and are making it. The YETP program is for students who cannot make it -- are not making it -- in the regular program.

Steve: We are using our 10th and 11th grade career exploration sites and turning them into sites for D.E. to use during the senior year; thus, D.E. people are beginning to like us.

Steve: All the schools we are dealing with are heavily involved with Federal funds on an annual funding cycle. CETA funds are not that much less predictable than other Federal funds.

Steve: Our county career education coordinator was the "shoe horn" that helped us get into schools. He serves as Chairman of our Youth Advisory Council. He made contacts with schools for us and helped us establish contacts. He made a presentation for us to the school board. Now I try to be a source of information when educators have questions, but I would not be able to do so had our county career education coordinator not "opened the door."

Polo: One of the things we have done in our SEA is to draw the CETA and vocational education programs out in graphic form so people can clearly see "CETA" and "vocational education." The prime difference YETP has made, over some forms of traditional vocational education, is that YETP offers youth a way of being paid for their work experience. We depend on the vocational education and the career education people in LEAs to help us explain YETP to other educators.

Willie: The career education people feel YETP is duplicating their efforts. I explain to them is that, in YETP, we are dealing with a special segment of the population.

C.C.: Why could we not have had today's discussion prior to ever getting any of the Federal funding for YETP?

Don: Because it is typical for educators to "react" instead of to "act."

C.C.: Is there, in fact, some real competition between CETA and education?

Polo: Competition is the "name of the game" in any community action program. You have got to let the conflicts come out -- and then look at the question of where the resources are to resolve the conflicts. In this case, CETA offers us the resources to do this conflict resolution.

Jay: We have a mutual arrangement between the school districts and the Prime Sponsors. One thing that helped us was our attempt to put together a proposal for Youth Work. We found that the vocational education people wanted a particular kind of program and thought Youth Work was a way of getting it. We put CETA people in the school district to work with school people in writing the proposal. Even though we did not get the Youth Work funding, it was worth it just to get the relationships between CETA and education established.

C.C.: We certainly need to put various kinds of Federal programs together. I think it would not be bad to put "unemployment offices" and "food stamp offices" together so that those receiving food stamps would have to pass through the unemployment procedures. Maybe it would cut down on the number needing food stamps!

Steve: Eventually, the YETP "22 percent money" would not be here. We want the schools to think of these programs as their own so they will continue after the "22 percent money" ends. In the school districts with which we work, educators seem to understand the CETA ground rules and accept them. They like the YETP program.

Florence: We see three YETP components: (1) career awareness/exploration; (2) career counseling; and (3) basic skills. It is important to talk in terms of what is familiar to educators. For example, career education and counseling are familiar to counselors, while basic education skills are familiar to the classroom teacher. When all parties recognize the value of the program within their own frame of reference, it will be more easily accepted. The point is, YETP provides us a means of adding to the effectiveness of our efforts in providing these three elements -- which educators are already committed to addressing.

Steve: We made our YETP presentations to guidance and cooperative education staff persons after we had met with superintendents. We were afraid counselors would see this presentation as a criticism of them; instead, they welcomed it as a way of helping them do what they had previously been unable to do alone. The "pitch" I used was to tell them that a typical person coming into our employment office was a high school graduate, about 19 1/2 years old, who has had a number of temporary dead-end jobs. Each one learned about CETA and came for help in establishing a more definite and a more secure career future. As a group, they are very naive about the world of work. We explain to educators that, through YETP, we hope to turn this around through reaching youth while they are still in school -- and on a year-round basis -- rather than a two-hour counseling session. After age 19-20, it is too late.

C.C.: Steve is an exception among CETA persons. How can we get other CETA people to think and act like this? Is there anything in the Federal system to assure that this will happen?

Steve: Remember, CETA is political. One advantage of this is that CETA can act quickly. If I were a superintendent of schools, I would get the CETA regulations, CETA law, and a regular CETA newsletter and then design my own program and take it to my CETA Prime Sponsor. If the Prime Sponsor resists, I would go immediately to the chief political official in the town and complain. This is one way to get quick and effective action.

Janet: The State Employment and Training Council (i.e., what used to be the "State Manpower Planning Council") is supposed to look at the effectiveness of all CETA programs. A local school district could take problems it is having with CETA Prime Sponsors to that body and get action.

Jay: It would not work in New Mexico.

Don: It would not work in Arizona, either.

Polo: The State Employment and Training Council meets only four times a year. To get continuity, we have created Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs) that have representatives from each of our six planning districts in our CETA Balance of State operation. There are staff people here who are available to serve as resource persons in resolving LEA/CETA Prime Sponsor conflicts.

Willie: We found we had to go to each program person related to YETP and explain our effort as an expansion and supplement to each of these regular education programs. That is the best way to deal with the insecurities of vocational education and career education persons.

C.C.: Would it be possible to have someone mandate that, before the "22 percent money" is released, you have to have a local Planning Council that includes educators?

Jay: That is what is supposed to happen.

Janet: The Youth Planning Council reviews (even if it does not formally approve) the 22 percent agreements. If it does not think the agreement is working properly, the Prime Sponsor can be in trouble.

C.C.: How do we handle the current "back to basics" trust and still bring an active YETP effort into our school systems?

Steve: Both "preparation for work" and "back to basics" are crucially important to today's youth. Community persons will not object if we try to stress both simultaneously.

Polo: I spent seven years with the Job Corps. It was a very successful program when we made it more local and went coeducational. We found youth improving in both academic skills and in vocational skills when we put them together in a sensible way.

Issue: How to resolve CETA funding cycles within the school year schedule

Don: We know YETP was developed so there would be a smooth transition from one year to the next, including transition from summer SPEDY programs to fall YETP. Yet, our YETP effort last year did not get underway until January. Some better way has to be found. The school districts are saying "If you cannot plan better, we do not want to be involved with YETP."

Polo: We have raised this issue with Prime Sponsors many times. They have agreed in Arizona on several corrective actions including: (a) providing assurances to LEAs of 90 percent of last year's funding, in advance of the start of the school year; (b) planning the in-school program in conjunction with the out-of-school YETP program; and (c) advising LEAs of availability of an advance of one month's money, with a requirement that each LEA send accounts to the Arizona Department of Education at least five days before the end of each month (so Prime Sponsors can know how much "free" money is around).

Don: These steps will solve the problem if the Prime Sponsor agrees to a contract before the "carry-over funds" are depleted. We have no control over the Prime Sponsor. It can delay a contract to an LEA for as long as it wants, up to six months.

Polo: Unless the Prime Sponsor makes contracts with LEAs on time, there is no way the State Board will agree to a proposed contract. That would put the Prime Sponsor in potential trouble.

Gary: This has not been a problem for us. There is always "carry-over money" for use in paying the start-up costs. Those small amounts are sufficient to get staff in place for the next year's YETP effort.

Willie: We need a CETA "letter of intent" from the Prime Sponsor before we, in the LEA, hire personnel. While, to be sure, the formal signing for YETP cannot take place until after October 1, we can, with this "letter of intent," begin our YETP program on September 1 when school opens.

Don: I would not start it with a "letter of intent." Without a signed contract, I would not feel comfortable beginning.

Polo: AGREE WITH DON. A letter of intent is not a legal document. Only Congress makes appropriations, and that is all you can count on.

Steve: It was not a problem for us. What we did was simply start in September. We knew the money was coming. At the beginning, there was a five percent "planning grant" which let us start. We did not have kids until January, so expenses were not high. The next year, we begin in August using "end of year money"; we assume that new money will be coming in October.

Jay: So long as the City Council has approved the grant application -- even though the YETP money has not come in yet -- we have no trouble using unobligated funds from other CETA programs to begin our in-school YETP operations. We, too, operate on a "letter of intent" basis. We do check with the Federal Representative at the Department of Labor Regional Office to let that person know and to get verbal approval. This year, we had to borrow money from our youth programs to bail us out on one of our PSE programs, so it works both ways. With proper planning, there is no reason why the difference in funding cycles should be a problem.

CC: We have a contract with the Prime Sponsor "Balance of State" before school starts. BUT, along about November, there are sometimes additional revenues without enough planning time.

Gary: Every superintendent in our five-county area knows about the "22 percent money." Our Prime Sponsor has simply said that there will be only one financial YETP agreement and the other four (small school districts) will be non-financial agreements.

Jay: We have our superintendent "blackmailed" in a way, because he depends so much on getting PSE CETA money (for maintenance people, teacher aides, etc.). If we threaten him with the notion that some of his PSE people might be discontinued, the superintendent will sign any YETP agreement we give him. With the new PSE limits on wages, we may lose this leverage next year because, in effect, our PSE program will be killed.

Don: There is a legitimate fear in the LEAs that they do not know what the Prime Sponsor is going to do with the CETA money it has, including its YETP money.

Gary: In Kansas City, our PSE unit is so big I have no contact with it. PSE does not affect my youth programs at all.

C.C.: AGREE WITH GARY. I deal with these parts completely separately. The schools have little or no input into the kinds of CETA money that will be coming. We need some way through which LEAs can tie CETA youth money into the regular school program. In general, most Alabama superintendents understand little, if anything, about CETA -- let alone its youth programs. When, and if, they ever find out, CETA may have troubles.

Janet: The Department of Labor Regional Administrator, through the Governor, announces the CETA allocations in early July, typically by giving a figure equal to 90 percent of last year's allocation. The word has to get back to the LEAs through the SEA. The Prime Sponsor loses the whole 22 percent of its youth money if it is not allocated to LEAs. That is the LEA's "clout." Most LEAs do not even know they have this "clout."

Willie: Big city school districts are heavily dependent on Federal funding. If school employees in large city systems do not know about availability of Federal funding and how to get it, their jobs are in jeopardy.

Issue: How to avoid duplication of services

Don: We had a subcontractor with which our county decided it did not want to continue working. Instead, the county government went to LEAs with various "mandates" about what it wanted without ever stopping to discover how many of these things the LEAs were already doing. This made LEAs angry. Eventually, we wound up with a non-financial agreement which provided that the Intermediate School Unit would serve as the "coordinating agency." Since then, agreement, has worked well. Recently, the county set up an independent testing program for in-school and out-of-school youth which is now causing problems. It has been stopped by the LEAs.

Janet: A structure exists to avoid duplication of services, but it often does not work. That structure is the A-95 Clearinghouse authorized by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), expressly charged with avoiding duplication of services.

Jay: The "A-95" in our State comes under our New Mexico State Department of Finance and Administration. In addition, there is a regional clearinghouse within the State that is supposed to avoid duplication. In practice, it is mainly a formality of notification.

Gary: AGREE WITH JAY. It is just a formality.

Don: It is at the county level where attempts to duplicate services are going on. There, people often do not take time to discover what others are doing.

Polo: It is more a matter of lack of knowledge than lack of good intentions. The high rate of staff turnover is partly to blame for this problem.

Gary: We do not have problems with duplication of services.

Jay: It is not an issue for us with respect to YETP, but there is duplication in some other parts of our total CETA operation.

Steve: It would be hard for us to have duplication of services because we are dealing only with relatively small school districts.

Florence: The potential for duplication is present, but it has not happened.

Willie: There are some transition services going on in our regular career education program. Youth Projects, under YETP, are a separate entity. Thus, the potential for duplication is present, and, to some extent, undoubtedly takes place. We try to avoid it by emphasizing YETP as an effort that concentrates on the economically disadvantaged, while the regular school career education program is for all students.

Janet: There is obvious duplication, at least in resources, seen in Title I, ESEA, with its career education emphasis on Grades K-6.

Willie: In our system, we were told Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Emergency School Aid Act, and YETP all include provisions for career education.

Janet: Regardless of age or grade level, we are basically talking about the same segment of the population -- i.e., the economically disadvantaged -- whether we think of serving them: (1) through ESEA as young children; (2) through YETP as adolescents; or (3) through CETA as adults. The basic duplication is in resources.

Polo: Where I have the greatest troubles with duplication of services is with the wide variety of Advisory Councils that are mandated under different sections of the law. There is a fantastic number of them. It is really impossible to (a) get them all together; (b) get them to agree on anything; or (c) get them to meet deadlines.

Don: I am currently a member of eight Arizona Advisory Councils. I see duplication all the time.

Polo: I made a recommendation that the local advisory council on vocational education be combined with the local manpower planning council; the local career education advisory council should also be part of this same package.

Steve: There should not be duplication of services if everyone is doing his/her job right. Too many people think of CETA as a bureaucratic labyrinth; in fact, it is highly political and any complaints are taken seriously. Influencing CETA is not nearly as hopeless as many schools apparently believe.

Issue: How to keep the prime emphasis of YETP on the economically disadvantaged

Steve: I would like, ideally, to keep the emphasis on the disadvantaged without wasting either facilities or resources. In the past, we have been under-enrolled, although we will be up to capacity next year. Even so, we think that the EBCE experience would be valuable for all kids and we wish there were practical ways of including youth from all economic backgrounds.

Jay: In our HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM PROGRAM, we have room for only 50 students to be drawn from 10 high schools. There are hundreds of others who would like to participate. Some middle income youth are hurting much more than the economically disadvantaged (in terms of no food stamps, taxes to pay, etc.) but we cannot serve them. It is a concern of both the CETA Prime Sponsor and the LEAs.

Steve: There are two basic ways we can, through YETP, help non-economically disadvantaged youth: (a) set up the classic experiment for the "students from all economic levels"; this option calls for a rigorous experimental design which is beyond our capacity; or (b) provide all students with: (1) counseling, (2) occupational/ educational information, (3) placement, (4) job referral, and/or (5) assistance in overcoming job-related sex stereotyping. Note that the law and the YETP rules and regulations used to say all students could have "transition services" (which included "vocational exploration"), but that provision does not appear in the latest revision of the YEDPA rules and regulations.

Polo: When I was in Job Corps, we had "waiver conditions" that would allow us to include non-disadvantaged persons. This kind of common sense approach should also be used in YETP. If you separate out the economically disadvantaged completely, you create a stigma that is harmful to them.

C.C.: The problem is how we can make YETP work as an integral part of our school systems -- not as something that is, in operation, separate from the school system.

Willie: The term "disadvantaged" means much more than "economically disadvantaged." That CETA speaks only to "economically disadvantaged" is a problem.

Janet: Different laws provide us with different definitions of "disadvantaged." Some provide more leniency than others. The greatest leniency is found in the vocational education legislation. We should not fight the "economically disadvantaged" section of YETP; instead, we should look for other kinds of efforts that do not carry this same kind of restriction.

Willie: It would make it a lot easier for us if CETA and vocational education got together and agreed on a common definition of "disadvantaged."

Don: One of the biggest operational problems is that, at present, there are a wide variety of kinds of Federal programs -- from both HEW and DOL -- that are bringing their funds to LEAs and saying "WE know what the needs of your students are." What should be happening is that the LEAs should answer, for themselves, "WHAT ARE THE NEEDS OF OUR STUDENTS?" and then, as various Federal programs come along, determine, for each, whether or not -- and the extent to which -- each meets one or more of these LEA identified needs.

Polo: Of all the various kinds of Federal programs now coming to schools, YETP is currently the most disruptive one to LEAs because: (a) it has "minimum wage" tied in with it; and (b) it has the "maintenance of effort" requirement.

Janet: Do not be pessimistic. Conceivably, the out-of-school components of YETP do not need to limit us. Maybe we simply need LEAs to become more creative.

Don: The non-school part of YETP is a problem in that, as programs create job slots for those youth, fewer jobs are available for the in-school YETP and other cooperative education programs offered by the educational agencies.

C.C.: AGREE WITH JANET. We are interpreting the YETP legislation too much in terms of what we cannot do instead of looking for ways to do everything we can do.

Polo: The current "urban mentality" has led Congress to legislate things that favor big cities, especially big Eastern cities. When you get to Rural America, there are very limited resources for use by all the competitive Federal programs. It is not easy in Rural America.

C.C.: One fear our teachers have is that CETA is, in effect, paying some youths to come to school. To overcome this, we laid down two additional guidelines for our YETP students: (a) the youth must pass his/her courses; and (b) the youth must maintain an "X percent" attendance record. If both conditions are not met, we drop the youth from YETP participation.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 117
Role of Additional School Counselors
March 8 and 9, 1979

Participants

Mr. A. Durand Osborne
Guidance Counselor
Chesterton Senior High School
Chesterton, Indiana

Ms. Gloria Murray
Career Education Consultant
Department of Public
Instruction
Indianapolis, Indiana

Ms. Bettye Tumlinson
Director
Youth Employment Service (YES) Center
Wichita, Kansas

Mr. John Carney
Administrative Assistant for
Youth Programs
Employment and Training Center
Wichita, Kansas

Mr. Ronald L. Bolam
Program Director
Allegheny Intermediate Unit/YETP
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. Joseph E. Kennedy
Manager of Youth Programs
Allegheny County Department
of Jobpower
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. Sam Owens
Director of Vocational Education
Claiborne County Schools
Tazewell, Tennessee

Ms. Nancy Perkey
CETA Interviewer
Tennessee Department of
Employment Security
Tazewell, Tennessee

Mr. Francis J. Fruzen
Senior Principal
Beloit Memorial High School
Beloit, Wisconsin

Mr. Peter D. Disley
YEDPA Coordinator
Janesville, Wisconsin

Observers

Mr. Stephen Frantz
Career Development Specialist
Youth Employment Education
State Department of Education
St. Paul, Minnesota

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, DC

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, DC

Ms. Lynn Bayer
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, DC

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to identify the concept of "vocational" counselors vs "ordinary" school counselors.

2. How to do pre-vocational assessment for the exceptional child.

3. How to cope with the high cost of staffing.

4. How to coordinate services of Community Based Organizations for youth.

5. How to coordinate and bring together school counseling, career education, and vocational education.

6. How to alleviate fears of Community Based Organizations.

7. How to resolve the differences in training preparation of counselors.

8. How to resolve increases in cost due to additional certification requirements.

9. How to get the counselor more involved in the YETP program.

10. How to more fully utilize program personnel.

11. How to coordinate SPEDY programs with other YETP in-school programs.

12. How to provide career/vocational education as part of a whole service.

13. How to avoid the separation of counseling functions into specialized areas.

14. How to remove "barriers" to free-flow between vocational education and school curriculum.

15. How to resolve the differences in program philosophy/definitions between LEAs and Prime Sponsors.

16. How to expand the "contact" time with the student participating in YETP.

17. How to improve communications between SPEDY and YETP programs.

18. How to mesh the various funding cycles.

19. How to alleviate the paper work and "red tape."

20. How to encourage those students who are eligible to identify themselves so that they can participate in YETP.

21. How to match job skills with placement slots.

22. How to match initial expectations with realistic job skills.

23. How to reduce the bias against vocational education being less academic.

24. How to gain acceptance by school counselors, administrators, and "academic" teachers for the YETP program.

25. How to provide counselors with the type of preparation better suited for YETP participants' needs.

26.. How to develop a realistic definition of successful completion of a YETP program.

27. How to gain private industry's acceptance of program participants.

28. How to reduce the "threat" of unlicensed personnel to counselors and of the "licensed" personnel to YETP personnel.

29. How to resolve the differences in pay scales of YETP personnel and counselors.

30. Should guidance counselors be certified to provide services in the YETP program?

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Nancy Perkey and Sam Owens - Tazewell, Tennessee

Sam (LEA representative)

We are a rural Tennessee community with about 6,500 students. As Director of Vocational Education, I am assigned the YETP job. YETP has really helped our vocational education program. From March to September last year, we were funded for a YETP "TRANSITION SERVICES"-only project. This year, we have been funded again for TRANSITION SERVICES.

We have three staff persons working with our three high schools to: (a) work with business/industry personnel to identify job slots and (b) work with school staff.

We are also funded under Tennessee's "Governor's Youth Program" (GYP), using Title II CETA funds. The emphasis here is on what, in regular YETP, is called "CAREER EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCES"; students are paid while on their part-time jobs in this program. The program itself is divided into three segments:

- Second semester seniors are placed three hours per day in PSE jobs related to their career goals. They get 1 1/2 units of academic credit for this.
- A two-week career exploratory sampling experience is in a business/industry setting.
- A summer component involves 30 students employed seven hours per day. They will get academic credit too.

The overall purpose of our YETP program is to assist students in clarifying their career goals and to provide each student with career exploration opportunities. (NOTE: A side benefit accrues to non-YETP participants who listen to YETP youth tell about their experiences in the business/industry community.) Each YETP youth is exposed to two hours of counseling weekly. In our last year's SPEDY program, we used our YETP transition people to help identify students for SPEDY. This is another advantage of YETP.

Nancy (Prime Sponsor representative)

My role, as a CETA employee, is to work with Sam in carrying out this local program, to identify potential eligible participants, and to refer such persons to the LEA. We do followup during the training period and, after training, help with PLACEMENT. I work for the Tennessee State Employment System which is the CETA Prime Sponsor for the Balance of State effort.

In addition to YETP, I am responsible for all employment/training programs in the county.

Questions and Answers

Q - Does the Employment System handle each of the counties for YETP purposes in Balance of State?
A - Yes.

Q - Are your transition services limited to economically disadvantaged youth?
A - On paper, yes. However, whatever materials we develop are available to all kids.

Q - Have you ever found it necessary to deny a service to non-economically disadvantaged youth?
A - No, not in our "transitional services" program.

Q - Do you have additional staff for your GYP program?
A - Yes, one more person. There are 780 students in our YETP "transition services" program and 247 in our GYP program.

Q - Is job followup strictly a responsibility of the Employment Service?
A - We both do followup.

Q - How has the YETP transition services element helped your vocational education program?
A - It has helped to overcome bias between academic and vocational teachers. It has also been helpful as a public relations effort with business and industry.

Q - What do you do in your two-week career sampling experience?
A - Youth are out 1/2 day per week for two weeks. Instead of being in their regular vocational education classes, they participate in this program for the two-week period. The career they participate in is related to the vocational training they are taking. (For example, an auto mechanics students is placed in a car repair shop.) These students are paid for this two-week period.

Q - Are all of the kids in your GYP program enrolled in vocational education?
A - Yes.

Peter Disley and Fran Fruzen - Janesville, Wisconsin

Peter (Prime Sponsor representative)

We do the YCCIP, YIEP, YETP, pre-employment, and in-school program for potential dropouts. We have three youth representatives who go out in the field to work with counselors, employers, etc. Through our LEA agreements, we established relationships with surrounding high schools. We work directly with their job counselors and encourage use of our computer terminal system. In only one year, we were able to put 3,000 youth through our computer system, the Wisconsin Career Information System (WCIS).

Our program concentrates on the economically disadvantaged.

In our Youth Work Experience (YWE) program, we are 98 percent on schedule. In YETP, it is hard to define "success" and to know if you are on schedule.

Our WCIS system is also made available for use by non-economically disadvantaged youth.

By making WCIS available to ALL youth, it sometimes creates problems in terms of motivating YETP-eligible youth to enroll in the YETP program.

With the help of our LEAs, we were able to get the rest of our community involved.

Fran (LEA representative)

The basis for our program is the "DETECTION/PREVENTION DROPOUT PROGRAM" that we have had for three years. Our goal is to identify and help potential dropouts.

Our primary goal is to use career exploration as a way of encouraging potential dropouts to remain in school, using work experience as a method.

The specific goals are to improve:

- Attendance patterns - 51 percent of the students in the program have improved their attendance over last year.
- Grade Point Averages - 48 percent raised their grade point average over last year.
- Behaviorial patterns - self image improved.
- Job seeking/getting/holding skills.

Our target population is 16-21 year old potential dropouts we have identified.

YETP Career Experiences include:

- Examination of self and of the world of work
- An in-depth exploration of one or more careers
- Exposure of participants to the economic system
- Placement

All youth in YETP can receive up to two units of academic credit.

We have 25 work experience programs with specific job descriptions. Our emphasis is concentrated on career exploration.

All of our YETP students go through: (a) WCIS, (b) ASVAB, and (c) ACT Career Planning Program.

All YETP participants are paid minimum wage for the work experience portion. It is carefully monitored by us, both in time spent in school and out on the work experience.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you define "potential dropouts" for the Prime Sponsor?
A - Yes:

- Poor attendance (three absences per quarter)
- Poor achievement (one or more failures)
- Poor attitude (possibility of withdrawal)
- Poor behavior (one or more office referrals)
- Insufficient credits (one-half credit below class standing)

Those students who are identified as potential dropouts must also meet the standards of "economically disadvantaged" to be placed in the program.

Q - What additional staff did you get for your Beloit YETP effort?
A - None. It is just an add-on to the high school principal's job. We realize the Federal government has put in some new reporting requirements that may make a need for some special YETP staff, but we have had none up to now.

Q - How are special needs students, including handicapped, taken care of in your extensive testing process?
A - We do not have special tests for them, but we do take these persons into account.

Q - What do you use your YETP money for in the Beloit program?
A - Primarily to pay students for work experience. We use a little for materials.

Q - Are there any Native Americans in the Beloit area?
A - Very few.

Q - How does this YETP program fit into your regular career education program?
A - YETP participants get a priority treatment they would not otherwise receive.

Q - Explain further how the fact you let all students receive some transitional services keeps some of the disadvantaged from enrolling in YETP.

A - We cannot always promise them they will get paid work experience because we cannot find jobs slots for all of them.

Q - Did you use the five percent Governor's money to put the WCIS terminals in the schools?

A - Yes. By doing so, it helped us sell YETP to the LEAs.

Durand Osborne and Gloria Murray - Indianapolis, Indiana

Gloria (Prime Sponsor representative)

I am a CETA employee assigned full-time to the SEA Career Education Program. Our YETP efforts concentrate, in the Balance of State portion, on 14-15 year olds. Of 199 school corporations eligible to participate, 187 agreed to do so.

Materials Resource Component - We gave each school the possibility of applying for career education funds under this YETP effort. Schools used these funds mostly to buy career education materials for use in YETP.

Inservice Education Component - Provides technical assistance to teachers. This year, each school gets a flat amount of money. This is supplemented with regional workshops for various career education topics (e.g., "infusion," "community involvement," "role of administrators in career education," etc.). In the SEA, we regard our prime role as a resource/sharing facility. We seek to encourage schools to share materials, methods, and successes with each other. Our SEA YETP career education effort allows us to work closely with the Indiana Office of Manpower and Development (IOMD). YETP materials purchased by schools can be -- and are -- used in summer SPEDY programs. We use YETP funds to pay mileage and per diem for educators to attend our career education workshops.

Evaluation - It is hard to deal with this precisely in YETP. Our State Advisory Council on Career Education provides a great amount of help to us.

Durand (LEA representative - an example of YETP in one high school)

We had, prior to YETP, a good Career Center. It was well equipped and well staffed.

Our counselors wanted something in addition to the Career Center, so we established a three-part Summer Program to: (a) place as many 14-15 year olds on jobs as possible; (b) compile a notebook on careers in our local community; and (c) compile a set of bulletin boards showing people at work.

Placement program for 14-15 year olds - We talk about it to the students in the spring and ascertain interest. We then get wide radio and newspaper publicity, telling our community that we have lots of 14-15 year olds who want to work in the summer. The result is that we get jobs for lots of these kids.

As we went out to members of our business/industry community, we asked them what kinds of persons they want the schools to give them. They asked for kids who:

- Will be punctual in their daily attendance on the job;
- Have a real willingness to work;
- Have the ability to get along with other people;
- Have the ability to speak, read, and write -- i.e., to communicate with others.

We took all of our information regarding possible training courses and let employers tell us what kinds of training they think are necessary for jobs in their business. We used part of our YETP funds to prepare a booklet containing their replies. We plan to re-do this booklet every two years.

Bulletin Board Project - We developed a "career awareness contest." Kids could win prizes (like a nice pen and pencil set).

The placement file for our 14-15 year olds is kept in our Career Center.

Questions and Answers

Q - How many people are involved in your YETP effort?
A - Two counselors plus one assistant, all paid from YETP funds in the summer.

Q - Is your whole State effort limited to 14-15 year olds?
A - Yes, in the Balance of State portion. The IOMD made that decision.

Q - Is your YETP program for all kids -- i.e., not just for economically disadvantaged?
A - Yes, it is for ALL kids.

Q - Are questions being raised with you about the new YETP rules and regulations?

A - No. The only problems we have had were when LEAs wanted to buy hardware.

Q - Are you having trouble finding jobs for 14-15 year olds?

A - No, it has worked very well. Our problem was one of getting enough kids to fill all the jobs we found for them.

Q - Do you think this YETP effort for 14-15 year olds will encourage students to enroll in distributive education and/or work-study programs in the senior high school?

A - It is possible. I cannot answer that.

Bettye Tumlinson and John Carney - Wichita, Kansas

John (Prime Sponsor representative)

We sub-contracted YCCIP to one CBO and a part of SPEDY to another CBO. We sub-contracted a part of SPEDY to the school system; in that part, students got academic credit. Under YETP, we sub-contracted with three CBOs and with the Wichita school system. The school system's part is the YES system that Bettye will describe.

Bettye (LEA representative)

"YES" (Youth Employment Service) opened its doors last year. It is for 16-21 year olds -- primarily out-of-school youth. Half of our clients are high school graduates and the other half are high school dropouts.

There is an in-school non-CETA program including career education, cooperative education, work experience, placement, career observation, etc. BECAUSE WE ALREADY HAD A GOOD EXISTING IN-SCHOOL PROGRAM, WE DECIDED TO USE YETP FUNDS FOR OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH -- THOSE WE HAD FAILED TO REACH IN OUR REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

YES is primarily transition services. It is in a special YETP building (that also houses other CETA operations) and works like a "store front," not a school.

YES is staffed for us by our CBOs -- SER, Urban League, Mid-America Indian Center, the State Employment Service, and the school district Each was asked to provide us with one counselor for the YES center. (Of our CBOs, only NAB and the Chamber of Commerce do not supply us with counselors.)

We steer youth toward work experience opportunities that will help youth develop good work habits that are transferable to any occupation.

We have a GED program for high school dropouts. For 17-18 year olds who are dropouts and wish to re-enter high school, we help them do so. (Not many do.)

Our counseling has been mostly on an individual basis. We are just now beginning to move into group counseling.

The academic credit offered by our school system for SPEDY last year was NOT a typical vocational exploration program; instead, it was one developed by the school system. We probably will not have academic credit offered this year through the city's part of SPEDY but will for the school system's part.

Our problem now is getting an identity among counselors for the YES Center.

In our first nine months, we had 130 intakes and made about 600 full-time job placements.

CETA came in after the school system already had a good career education program. That is why we elected to use YETP funds for out-of-school youth. The school's career education program (primarily a K-8 operation) is in its fifth year.

Questions and Answers

Q - Who pays the counselors' salaries in the YES Center?
A - CETA.

Q - Do the YES counselors have to learn about their CBOs as well as about YES?
A - Yes. Theoretically, they should have come from their CBOs and so already have known about them. In actuality, the CBOs hired new persons and assigned them to the YES Center.

Q - If a kid goes to a CBO first, does the CBO refer him/her to the "YES Center"?
A - It works both ways.

Q - How do you work with NAB and with your Chamber of Commerce?
A - They help us primarily with job development.

Q - Is "YES" now under a YETP contract with the school system?
A - Yes.

Q - What kinds of contributions does the school system make to "YES"?
A - Things nobody else could do -- for example, supplying lists of kids who have dropped out of school.

42

Q - Do you, Bettye, as a school employee, get paid on a school salary schedule or on a CETA salary schedule as the "YES" Director?
A - I am paid on a CETA-approved salary schedule but my check comes to me from the school district. I am a school system employee.

Q - Do all YES counselors get paid what they would have been paid had they been working at the CBO from which they came?
A - Yes. Salaries vary depending on the CBO.

Q - Do you see a time coming when YETP funds will be used to help make your school system career education program work better?
A - Yes, but it has not been considered yet.

Q - What has your school board had to say about the YES program?
A - It considers it a logical extension of "schooling."

Joe Kennedy and Ron Bolam - Allegheny County, Pennsylvania

Joe (Prime Sponsor representative)

When YEDPA was passed, the Prime Sponsor was faced with doing something about all its parts, including YETP. We noticed that 22 percent of YETP funds were to be used with schools and were somewhat taken aback because we had not worked closely with schools before that time.

There are 46 school districts in our area, in addition to Pittsburgh; thus, we decided to work with the Allegheny Intermediate Unit because it already had contacts with these 46 school districts and we, in CETA, did not.

Problems we encountered in the first 1 1/2 years:

Slow start up due to

- Lack of understanding and communication with school districts;
- Lots of paper work;
- 45 school districts to contact individually;
- School districts spread over a wide geographic area;
- Confusion between YETP and an already existing in-school program being operated by one of our CBOs;
- THIS YEAR - necessity for verifying eligibility of participants.

Obtaining academic credit - Because our YETP effort started in February, it was impossible to arrange. We now have an Academic Task Force working on it.

Loss of control by Prime Sponsor - By sub-contracting, first of all, with the Intermediate Unit and then letting it sub-contract with individual school districts, the Prime Sponsor lost some control over local school districts. (For example, we had problems with some LEAs which wanted to use "transition services" for non-economically disadvantaged youth.)

. High cost of dealing with school districts - as opposed to much lower relative costs when the Prime Sponsor subcontracts with a typical CBO.

Accomplishments of YETP to date:

- New linkages have been established with school districts. Communication is better. Working relationships have been improved. There is more interest.
- Establishment of an ACADEMIC CREDIT TASK FORCE, formed jointly by the Prime Sponsor and the intermediate unit.
- Expanded knowledge of educational resources available in Allegheny County. (Prime Sponsor had not previously known about all of them.)
- Expanded involvement with the Allegheny Intermediate Unit. For example, it ran a fairly large part of the summer program last year.
- In addition, we have become much more involved with its Career Planning Center.
- Utilization of the Intermediate Unit resources during the summer.
- Establishment of more OJT opportunities.
- Better services to the target groups of youth through already established units and services of the Intermediate Unit.

Ron (LEA representative)

We have seven special education programs in the county which CETA can use and does use. Our Intermediate Unit was initially funded through a combination of Federal and other kinds of funding. It is now self-supporting through contracts with each of the LEAs we serve.

We use the Guidance Information System of Time-Share Corporation.

We do extensive summer work, including GATB testing. We discovered students do have the potential for employability, but are being turned off by schools.

Our Student Career Planning Center is very active, including during the summer. Many students in YETP come back for extra counseling sessions on their own.

There are three major facets in our YETP program. career education, career counseling, and work experience.

Our career education program is handled by a local career education coordinator paid by YETP funds in each school district for the extra time required by YETP (including what is done in work site placements).

Career counseling is handled primarily through our Career Planning Center. We receive YETP funds to cover the costs of serving the YETP-eligible students.

Work experience (YETP "career employment experience") is 20 hours per week. Youth are paid the minimum wage, and work experience is related to the career goals of youth.

Questions and Answers

Q - Where are you with your exceptional individual program?
A - We hope to enlarge it. The new CETA authorization has a special clause in it that speaks about handicapped students.

Q - Who makes the YETP subcontract with the individual school districts?
A - The Intermediate Unit makes these subcontracts. It leaves the Prime Sponsor out. It is not a major problem yet BUT is something to be watched.

Q - How much trouble are the new "certification of eligibility requirements" of YETP causing you?
A - IT IS VERY, VERY BAD! You will see the effect this summer in the SPEDY program. We anticipate that, as a direct result of these new requirements, our SPEDY enrollments may well be cut in half.

SIX ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to get the counselors more involved in the YETP program.
- How to improve communications between SPEDY and YETP programs.
- How to encourage those students who are eligible to identify themselves so that they can participate in YETP.
- How to coordinate services of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) for youth.
- How to gain private industry's acceptance of YETP program participants.
- How to coordinate and bring together school counseling, career education, and vocational education.

Issue: How to get the counselors more involved in the YETP program

Sam: Florida has a program of "Occupational Specialists" where the main requirement of applicants is work experience. That is what is really needed. They need some training, too, of course, but WORK EXPERIENCE is what counselors in YETP really need. If you had a mixture of one certified counselor with a number of "work experience counselors," it would be ideal. I have one counselor who does have formal counseling experience and three who do not. This works well for us.

Fran: Our counselors are concerned that we might wind up having "YETP COUNSELING SPECIALISTS." They do not want a "specialist in YETP." They feel a regular counselor ought to be able to do the YETP job. They do not want to: (a) take the YETP student out of the regular counseling program, or (b) run the danger of cutting off options for YETP enrollees.

Bettye: If the counselor is trained, primarily through work experience, there would have to be some LEA provision for non-certificated counselors to certify YETP enrollees for academic credit. In our "YES" Center, we do not have to worry about it, but in a regular school setting this would be a problem.

Gloria: I agree that any counselor who is qualified as a professional counselor ought to be able to deal with most of the kinds of problem any student brings to him/her.

Ron: Sam has a good point. In vocational education, the main contact point between student and employer is the teacher-coordinator. The counselor serves primarily as a support/backup person. In Pennsylvania, the teacher-coordinator certified YETP enrollees for academic credit, NOT the regular school counselor.

Durand: AGREE WITH FRAN. The professional counselor should be able to handle YETP students as well as others. Most counselors do have some work experience. To be a professionally certified school counselor now, you have to have 30 hours beyond the Master's degree. If you added a special "work experience" requirement, you would have the school counselor up to almost a doctoral degree before she/he finished.

Ron: Isn't there some kind of competency based approach to counselor education in Indiana? Answer: No.

Sam: To provide "transitional services," as called for under YETP, you do not need a professional counselor. The "occupational counseling" included in "transition services" is something that can be done by others.

Fran: AGREE. We *do not* need a professional counselor to provide YETP "transition services." In my role as principal, even I get into lots of counseling. I am not about to go back and get a degree in "counseling," however, nor do I need to do so for the counseling in YETP that I find it necessary to do.

Bettye: How do you separate occupational counseling from personal counseling?

Ron: The classroom teacher is the first step in counseling. The professional counselor is a support service. Thus, you are *not* really separating vocational counseling from regular counseling. If you need special expertise, the teacher can make a referral to the certificated counselor.

Durand: Professional counselors, of course, recognize that teachers are the No. 1 source of counseling, BUT that does not mean that everyone engaged in "counseling" should be thought of, or called, a "counselor."

Gloria: It is mainly a semantics problem. Why not just call the YETP person an "advisor" so we do not have to worry about counselor qualifications? The YETP person needs some background, but does not need an M.A. in counseling. Perhaps we ought to invent an "ASSOCIATE DEGREE IN ADVISING."

Steve: DISAGREE - We are talking about a *functional* difference, not a *semantic* difference. No two YETP projects operate in the same way. For example, we have one program for young women who are "inner city parents," where really high quality professional counseling is needed, and others, under YETP, where youth need primarily nothing more than some good work experience. Thus, there is no single "standard" you could reasonably set as "qualifications for YETP counselors."

John: AGREE WITH STEVE. It is *not* "semantic" but *real*. Three years ago, I was trying to do counseling but did not know what I was doing. Since getting my M.A. in counseling, I can see how badly I needed it. True, *some* kids simply need information, but many kids need much, much more.

Fran: The LEA should be required to provide both professional counseling and transition services BUT not necessarily delivered through the same person.

Ron: AGREE. LEAs differ in their YETP efforts. Some will need professional counselors while others will not.

Sam: AGREE. It ought to be left to the LEA/CBO to determine whether or not certificated counselors are needed in their YETP efforts.

Joe: DISAGREE. In the end, the responsibility rests with the Prime Sponsor. If you leave it up to the LEA, the Prime Sponsor could be hurt. The Prime Sponsor should have the discretion, not the LEA or the CBO.

Ron: There is also a money question involved. Seventy percent of our YETP funds have to go to student wages and fringe benefits. There is not much left for use in hiring many professional counselors.

Fran: The regulations of the Department of Labor should be written so that the question of how many and what kinds of counselors are needed becomes a part of the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. Let them decide at the local community level. NOTE: VERY IMPORTANT POINT.

Agree - 10. Disagree - 0.

NOTE: Unanimous agreement on this generalization.

Generalization: The definition of "handicapped" used in YETP should be the same as that used in P.L. 94-142. Agree - 10; Disagree - 0.

Issue: How to improve communications between SPEDY and YETP programs

Gloria: There are things that go on in SPEDY during the summer that could be coordinated with career education during the school year. This would save money, avoid duplicating materials, and find some good teachers for SPEDY who will, in the next school year, have some of the SPEDY kids in their classes for easy followup.

John: We have a coordinated program, but the problem is certification of student eligibility. We certify students as "YETP-eligible" and then have to certify them again as "SPEDY-eligible."

Joe: You could get a person eligible for YETP who is not eligible for SPEDY. For example, if his income lies between 70-85 percent of the lower living standard, he is eligible for YETP but not for SPEDY. That is, he must be "poorer" to be eligible for SPEDY than to be eligible for YETP. Any kid eligible for SPEDY *is* eligible for YETP, but the reverse is not true.

Pete: We had a regional SPEDY followup meeting last fall in which a recommendation was made that the Department of Labor ought to come up with only one requirement for "CETA eligible Youth," and that requirement ought to then qualify youth for *any* CETA program.

Sam: We have 720 eligible YETP participants in "transition services." Only 60 of these were able to get into SPEDY -- partly because some were not eligible and partly because the number of SPEDY slots were limited.

Nancy: Most of Sam's 720 would be SPEDY-eligible if we had the slots.

Joe: Sam is saying that no documentation is required to be YETP-eligible, BUT documentation *is* required to be SPEDY-eligible.

Sam: NO. We *do* have an eligibility document for YETP, but it is not as complicated as the one for SPEDY. This is because, in our YETP program, all our kids are in "transition services" where they are not paid money. IF we were paying them, then the certification would be the same as for SPEDY.

Question: Is it true that, if a youth is in the "transition services" part of YETP, she/he would not necessarily qualify for SPEDY but, if in the "career employment experience" part of YETP, she/he *would* be eligible for SPEDY?

Joe: If a youth is in only "transition services," you do not need eligibility criteria. If in the "career employment experience" part of YETP, the 85 percent lower living standard criterion must be met. Still, some of these youth obviously would not meet the 70 percent "lower living standard" required for SPEDY.

General Recommendation:

Pete: We would like to see the SPEDY requirements lowered to the point where YETP "career employment experience" requirements now are, *but* leave "transition services" requirements of YETP as they are.

Agree - 10. Disagree - 0.

Joe: The summer recruiting problems of SPEDY are very tough. It would be easier if this recommendation were adopted.

Pete: We should, in addition, be able to say that a kid, once declared eligible, should remain eligible for a one-year period.

Gloria: Okay, provided the counselor checks during the year to see if there is any change in the kid's economic status which would make her/him ineligible.

John: We have trouble getting 16-18 year olds interested in and qualifying for SPEDY, but have no problems getting plenty of "takers" among 14-15 year olds. As a result, we have more SPEDY-eligible applicants than job slots. Thus, if this recommendation is followed, the number of applicants we cannot serve is sure to increase.

Bettye: We also have more regular teachers who would like to be summer SPEDY teachers than we have positions open to hire them.

Issue: How can we encourage those students who are eligible to identify themselves so that they can participate in YETP?

Pete: We are running into the problem of having to re-certify our CETA-eligible people. We must do this every time the CETA regulations change. We have to always do "re-certification" for the summer program. This simply is not necessary and slows up our SPEDY operations.

Joe: The SPEDY regulations stipulate that youth must be:
(a) SPEDY income-eligible at the time of application; and
(b) SPEDY age-eligible at the time the program starts.
Knowing this, we could process SPEDY applicants as early as March.

Pete: Maybe I am talking about a rule that applies to Region V only.

Steve: AGREED. It is one of Department of Labor's biggest problems--i.e., that of finding consistency from Region to Region, from State to State, and from Prime Sponsor to Prime Sponsor.

Ron: The Department of Labor will ask what kinds of delivery system the Prime Sponsor will use to maintain the income eligibility requirements.

Fran: We could put the responsibility on the SPEDY participant.

Ron: The ultimate responsibility will always be on the Prime Sponsor.

Joe: Right now, Prime Sponsors are being "nailed" because they are not checking income criteria closely enough. The current trends are toward tightening up on this. Thus, the "one year eligibility" recommendation Pete is making flies in the face of current Department of Labor trends.

Ron: AGREE. As an LEA person, I would not consider putting a kid into YETP unless the Prime Sponsor certified her/him as "income eligible."

Joe: We, as the Prime Sponsor representatives, would not let you do it.

Issue: How to coordinate services of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) for youth

John: Part of the problem is that each CBO has its own special segment of the population for whom it feels "responsible" -- youth and adults as well. The CBO resists having the Prime Sponsor come in with YETP for youth in this special segment of the population.

Bettye: The question is, who can best understand and serve these youth through YETP, the Prime Sponsor or the CBO? For example, with a particular sub-portion of the population, it might, operationally, be more important for a counselor to be able to speak Spanish than to have a Master's degree in counseling.

Joe: Prime Sponsors have to give priority to CBOs in planning and carrying out programs. For example, under YCCIP, the Prime Sponsor has to write a justification if it does not give the subcontract to a CBO.

Sam: The LEA, for the transition services portion of YETP, is far better qualified than is any CBO for dealing with in-school youth -- and for the work experience portion for in-school youth as well.

Ron: Joe has considered putting together a single "YEDPA Youth Newsletter" to go to all CBOs and LEAs handling one or more of the YEDPA youth programs. But such a newsletter has never gotten off the ground because of a fear, from some sources, that it would be difficult to sustain it as a high quality document.

Bettye: We communicate with CBOs primarily by phone. Our CBO counselors in the "YES Center" cannot communicate any more about the CBO they come from than their own particular experience with that CBO. Because the CBOs hired new persons to send to us, some do not know enough about the CBO they represent.

Nancy and Pete: CBO coordination is not a problem for either of us, because we do not have those kinds of complications in a rural setting.

Issue: How to gain private industry's acceptance of YETP program participants

Nancy: Private industry tends to think we are trying to give it "problem kids." YETP counselors are helping to turn this around. Last summer, however, we had an OJT contract with an industry which laid off all the kids as soon as the training period was over, thus making them further discouraged.

Pete: The new "tax incentive program" is going to help.

John: DISAGREE. The private employer wants quality kids; the tax incentive provision will not solve this.

Durand: AGREE with John.

Joe: Even National Alliance of Businessmen cannot sell these youth to private industry through its VEP program. NAB is supposed to deal with the private sector, but really wind up with the same kinds of nonprofit groups that we do.

Steve: Some of our Prime Sponsors have recognized that the way to solve this problem, in the long run, is to begin working on changing kids early in their school years so we can develop the kinds of qualities industry wants before we try to send the kids out to industry. This is where a career education effort, beginning in the kindergarten, fits into the Department of Labor youth emphasis, including YETP.

Issue: How to coordinate and bring together school counseling, career education, and vocational education

Bettye: This problem is more than an organizational problem; it relates to our basic approach to providing services. There is a great deal of overlap, and we might be able to reduce it provided we begin to search for the commonalities. One problem is that the three pieces fit together well, but we often do not or cannot admit it; some vocational educators do not want to admit that career education has something to offer, and some career educators feel vocational education is too restrictive. It is a jurisdictional problem, but we need to find a way to work together.

Ron: I am concerned that we be careful not to make generalizations about career education or vocational education. Programs are different and there are examples of successful relationships.

Bettye: If we have successful programs, how are vocational education, career education and school counseling components brought together?

Ron: Administrative support is the key. If we hope to achieve a comprehensive program, we need to "swing" the administrators. There needs to be support from the top down.

Joe: As a CETA person, I am a little confused as to what the differences are between career education and vocational education. How can you be involved in vocational education and not have career education?

Bettye: I see career education as a total approach looking at all of life -- looking at personal and work values that relate to the total life experience. Vocational education, on the other hand, is an effort directed more toward skill development than toward problem solving. However, both career education and vocational education are moving in the same direction; they both are concerned about helping young people.

Durand: Career education attempts to provide more than skill development; career education is concerned with self-awareness, value awareness, and the development of positive attitudes toward work. Career education helps us look at the "whole" student. We should not separate career education, vocational education and school counseling; it should be one function, and that function is very definitely a career function.

Gloria: Career education serves all of the students in our schools; it should be a part of the entire K-12 curriculum. We are emphasizing awareness of career opportunities and attempting to shift the thinking in our schools to recognize that vocational education is a part of career education. The career educators are making an effort to work more closely with vocational education personnel. In our program, we are concentrating our funds on 14-15 year olds because of the nature of our agreement with IOMD.

John: Another issue involved in coordinating career education and vocational education with the school counseling program is licensing of counselors. Social workers have a certification process which counselors might take a close look at. At the present time, the duties of the career education counselor, the vocational education instructor, and the academic counselor are distinct and separate; we need to work on bringing the three closer together.

Ron: Higher education institutions (counselor preparation programs) place vocational counseling at the lower end of the professional continuum because it is viewed as an activity that merely provides or supplies information.

Fran: One problem faced in developing a more coordinated effort relates to the fact that career education is less concrete or more intangible than vocational education; there always seems to be a tendency to move closer to those activities which are easier to define, easier to measure, and easier to "grab a hold of conceptually."

Joe: This discussion touches directly on the issue of how to develop a realistic definition of what successful completion of the YETP program means. I have yet to discover how one can do vocational education counseling without doing career education counseling at the same time.

Fran: The public perceives all programs related to career development as being vocational education, and we tend to respond or react to the public notions. There is a difference between career education and vocational education, but that difference is difficult to identify without first looking at the total program.

Gloria: It is easier to evaluate vocational education, but the developmental nature of career education requires that we take a longer look at the process and makes it more difficult to evaluate over a short term.

Joe: What types of activities are you involved in, in career education, at the early school stage?

Gloria: In our program we provide each student an opportunity to develop an awareness of career options. Our idea is that we need to develop the "whole" person and we need to help each child develop the skills necessary to adjust to the changes he/she might face in the pursuit of a career -- that is, the skills necessary to adjust to the changes across an entire life span.

John: The problem of coordination may be exaggerated by the fact that vocational education is often viewed as a separate curriculum or discipline, like English -- and you teach English; you do not counsel English.

Joe: The tremendous need to quantify data forces us closer to a vocational education effort; however, the needs of the disadvantaged youth being served by the YETP program are better met by a career education approach because these youth need better attitudes more than they need technical skills.

Durand: To provide only vocational counseling would be cheating our youth; if young people are searching for an entry into the work force, they will need more than the information concerning relevant skills. We need to expand the awareness of our youth that permanent jobs are dependent on good attitudes.

Sam: The separation of career education, vocational education and school counseling is in large measure a factor of separate funding sources. The separate funding sources each have distinct sets of accountability; as one strives to be accountable, competition results. I do not think we can resolve the separateness until we deal with the issue of the funding sources.

John: CETA monies could be used as a unifying factor, as a way of bringing us all together. Educators should work more closely with CETA liaisons.

Durand: In Illinois, educators cannot work together. Academic high schools and vocational education high school programs are vying for the same state funds.

Gloria: In Indiana, educators are attempting to work closely with Prime Sponsors to coordinate services.

Steve: An example of how Minnesota is attemping to coordinate educational programs funded from different sources relates directly to the issue of coordinating counselor services. In one Minnesota school district, the counselor furnishes services for both a program to teach English as a second language and for a vocational education/work experience program. We see CETA as an opportunity to bring career education and vocational education closer together.

John: In Wichita, Kansas, the 22 percent monies, provided in a non-financial agreement, are routed through the school system administratively. The YETP in-school coordinator is in the division of vocational education. However, career education and counseling services are housed within other divisions. As Prime Sponsor, we are seeking all three services, but we work with a school district representative assigned to only one. Our difficulty is the coordination of services we seek and the school district's administrative structure.

Joe: CETA was originally designed to eliminate categorical funding and thus break down some of the barriers we have been discussing. As suggested earlier, I think the CETA funds could be used to help educators break down their programmatic barriers.

Sam: CETA funds can serve to help people work together.

Bettye: What we have all been alluding to is a political power play; someone is still going to want to coordinate, be it a CETA person or an educator. How do we coordinate?

Ron: We might be able to coordinate by using a "third party."

John: How does this avoid the problem of creating a "new" job or position? A new position costs money which we cannot afford.

Ron: One solution is to work through an advisory council. I would like to go back to the issue raised with regard to the awarding of academic credit for work experience. We attacked this problem through Project 81, and we see the problem as one which requires a competency based approach. It can be done, and vocational educators are supportive.

What are the barriers inhibiting effective coordination between career education, vocational education, and school counseling?

Steve: Lack of trust.

Ron: Lack of communication.

Walter: We need to examine how career education can help CETA, without being concerned about who gets the credit; this can be accomplished if we focus on the outcomes we desire for the participants in our programs. If we are truly concerned about outcomes, we will avoid setting in motion two separate educational systems -- one system serving the needs of those not academically oriented and one system serving the more elite "academic" student. Something which has not been mentioned is career development; I see career development as the key to meaningful CETA/education relationships, because career development is really what the transition services are all about.

Gloria: Indiana is using CETA funds to sponsor career education; we are providing the services that are needed, we are planting the "seed," and we are trying to work together.

Ron: Pre-service or teacher preparation programs fail to adequately prepare individuals to address the real needs of school-age youth. This deficiency is a serious problem; as a matter of fact, it ignores the problem.

Bettye: The "public" keeps asking why schools are not preparing youth to run machines, yet parents are asking why schools are not preparing their children to go on to college. The schools cannot be everything to everybody; we therefore face a real dilemma. What do we do?

Fran: I do not think it is the function of the school to subsidize the corporate business sector by preparing youth to run its machines. We need to help youth to develop proper attitudes toward work, not to focus exclusively on the development of technical skills. One way we can help youth acquire better coping behaviors is to develop a means for the comfortable flow of information among the relevant service agencies, and we should require a continual exchange of ideas and information.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 118
Transition Services for the Disadvantaged
March 15 and 16, 1979

Participants

Mr. Ernest Upthegrove, Consultant
Career Education
Division of Vocational and Adult Education
Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Florida

Mr. Maurice E. Wilson, Director
Manpower Development and
Training Programs (CETA)
Miami, Florida

Mr. Jerry Jenkins
Teacher/Coordinator
Scioto County Joint Vocational School
Lucasville, Ohio

Mr. Timothy Haffner
YETP Cordinator
Scioto Training and Employment Program
Portsmouth, Ohio

Ms. Frances Jackson
Director of Career Education
Great Falls Public Schools
Great Falls, Montana

Mr. Mark Bowlds, Chief
Youth Employment Programs Bureau
Employment and Training Division
Department of Labor and Industry
Helena, Montana

Dr. Lee Bowen
Supervisor of Career Education
Prince George's County Public Schools
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Mr. Alan Machtinger
CETA Planner
Office of Personnel
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dr. Thomas J. Jacobson, Director
Grants and Contracts/School Improvement
Grossmont Union High School District
La Mesa, California

Observers

Mr. Gene Berube
Education Program Officer
Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Mary Seibles
Education Program Officer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How can economically disadvantaged youth best be helped to make the transition from school to work?

2. How to solve the transportation problem in the career employment experiences portion of YETP.

3. How to build general employability skills into YETP.

4. How to fit YETP into a master plan for career education.

5. How to get a valid data base for evaluating YETP efforts in an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

6. How to use YETP in building basic academic skills.

7. How to identify and match student aptitudes/interests with community job sites.

8. How to help YETP youth make better career decisions.

9. How to generate interest in a 14-15 year old YETP effort.

10. How to convince school people to award academic credit for YETP participation.

11. How to convince employers to participate in the OJT portion of YETP.

12. How to convince schools that YETP is aimed at supplementing, rather than at supplanting, the school system's efforts.

13. How to sell school districts on the importance of a work/education effort in these "back to basics" times.

14. How to counteract the built-in distrust of CETA that many educators have.

15. How to use YETP as an effort to meet the needs of economically disadvantaged through a cooperative mechanism.

16. How to get SEAs to work positively, rather than negatively, in the YETP effort.

17. How to avoid the YETP effort that emphasizes only older high school students.

18. How to help change Prime Sponsor contracts from an emphasis on serving the greatest number of youth for the minimal amount of money, ignoring quality.

19. How to build quality into the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

20. How to communicate with Prime Sponsors in a coordinated, rather than a fragmented way, from the school district.

21. How to plan for using YETP funds in improving quality of school district plans.

22. How to educate LEA persons about CETA.

23. How to overcome problems of involvement with the private sector.

24. How to get a better definition of "disadvantaged."

25. How to overcome problems of dealing with individual schools in addition to the entire school district.

26. Differences in geographic coverage of Prime Sponsor territory and the school system's.

27. How to best follow-up YETP youth after they leave the school system.

28. How to solve the "paid vs. unpaid" work problem in YETP.

29. What do CETA Prime Sponsors need to know about the school system?

30. How to resolve the LEAs tendency to emphasize younger students with the Prime Sponsor's tendency to emphasize job placement.

31. How to solve the Fiscal Year differences between Prime Sponsors and school districts.

32. How to encourage YETP youth to more seriously consider vocational education.

33. Lack of adequate criteria for assessing eligibility of CBOs for YETP funds.

34. How to require CBOs to sign agreements with LEAs with respect to academic credit for the in-school youth they (the CBOs) are serving.

35. How to adequately locate and certify the eligibility of youth for YETP.

36. How to get better Department of Labor guidelines that will hold Prime Sponsors responsible for allocating YETP funds only to qualified CBOs.

37. How to get the Department of Labor to hold Prime Sponsors responsible for YETP programs under arrangements whereby the Prime Sponsor contracts with a "broker" who, in turn, wants to subcontract with the LEA to do the work.

DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY YETP EFFORTS

Alan Machtinger and Lee Bowen - Prince George's County, Maryland

Alan (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our in-school YETP program is divided into five groups, by grade level, with a specific set of learner needs identified at each grade level as follows:

- Ninth Grade - Concentrates on student assessment and career exploration.
- 10th Grade - Work experience only. (This is a heavy academic year with students typically taking six courses.)
- 11th Grade - Updating of student assessment plus a heavy emphasis on the career employment experiences portion of YETP, with work experience emphasized. Next year, additional emphasis will be placed here on career information private sector involvement and on an Experience Based Career Education effort.
- 12th Grade - Emphasis on "transition services" aimed at helping students get ready to move from school to work. Special attention paid to the process of training youth in job searching skills and in increasing contracts with potential employers in the community.
- Special Education Centers (for multiple handicapped youth). For 17 year olds, the emphasis is on student assessment. For 18-21 year olds, the emphasis is on work experience; different activities are planned for those youth who are apparently headed toward sheltered workshop settings as opposed to those heading toward competitive employment. The primary emphasis is on equipping these youth with job seeking/getting/holding skills.

Lee (LEA representative)

We are serving 70 secondary schools. Some YETP emphasis can be seen in each, but a special intensive effort is placed in five "YETP comprehensive" high schools, three "YETP comprehensive" schools and seven special education centers. In the "YETP comprehensive" schools, we try to include all possible YETP activities, including the work experience portion.

In some schools, the YETP emphasis amounts to not a great deal more than an income maintenance type operation, due to lack of funds to fully implement YETP in all of our secondary schools.

We have now established a very good collaborative relationship with our Prime Sponsor.

We are planning an expanded "transition services" effort for next year including:

- We will pick up YETP youth through CETA resource teachers who have a dual assignment of academic instruction coupled with supervised work experience.
- Eleventh grade students will spend the first semester in a classroom and the second semester in work experience.
- In addition, during the second semester, the CETA resource teacher will add an emphasis on counseling 12th graders in YETP who apparently are not college bound. The teacher will follow these students during the summer, and, hopefully, see them through to real job placement.
- Under this plan, the CETA resource teacher then would pick up a new group of YETP 11th grade students the following fall.

Questions and Answers

Q - What is the lowest age at which you take YETP youth?
A - 14 years old. We have 75 of these youth involved in an in-school YETP experience. In reality this project is handled under Title I (new Title II). The YETP program starts at the 10th grade, involving very few participants below age 16.

Q - Are those 75 14-year-olds receiving a stipend?
A - Yes, for 10 hours per week (at the minimum wage). This calls for them to work in the school (as an aide of some kind) two hours out of each school day, with the other four hours spent in regular academic instruction.

Q - What will your CETA resource teachers be doing with 11th graders during the second semester, when they take on the additional 12th grader duties?
A - The CETA resource teacher will supervise work experience for both 11th and 12th graders.

Q - What is a typical school day for a ninth grader enrolled in your YETP program?
A - This ninth grade program is NOT YETP; instead, we operate it through the new Title II-B CETA program -- i.e., the basic training program of CETA. These students all take courses in

English, math, and science. They then take a special "CETA course" (used for social studies credit). Finally, instead of typical "electives," they spend the remaining two hours of the school day working in the school, for which they receive one "student assistance credit" counting toward high school graduation.

Q - How many "CETA resource teachers" do you have at each grade level?
A - Three in the junior highs, five in the senior highs, plus one vocational assessment specialist and one "YETP Coordinator." The ninth grade "CETA resource teachers" are paid for with Title II-B funds, but the other positions are paid for with YETP funds as part of the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

Q - What percent of the YETP funds do you get for your LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement?
A - About 65 percent.

Q - Are you doing still other things in YETP?
A - We are operating a "70001 Project" this year.

Ernie Upthegrove and Maurice Wilson - Dade County, Florida

Maurice (Prime Sponsor representative)

We have 337 students in our YETP program. They spend their mornings in one of our regular vocational education programs. Their afternoons are spent in the work experience portion of YETP. Our YETP effort is staffed with five persons, three of whom are professionals. Student evaluations are carried out every nine weeks by an OJT supervisor.

YETP "transition services" are provided in classrooms by non-CETA personnel as a contribution of the school system to the total YETP program (including such things as outreach, bilingual education, and supportive services). Measures of our success:

- Seventy-five percent placement rate (we hire a job developer to accomplish this).
- We have 75 cooperating employer groups involved with us.
- We have a good system for awarding academic credit for YETP.
- We have excellent relationships with our CETA Prime Sponsor.

Weakness of our YETP effort is primarily seen in the fact that, while we have 33,000 students, many of whom are "YETP-eligible," we are able to mount a YETP effort for only 337 of them. Thus, many who could profit from YETP are still not being served.

Our YETP Advisory Committee (required by the Prime Sponsor) has been very helpful to us in our efforts to place YETP youth after they leave school.

Next year, we are going to tie our YETP effort in much more closely with the career education effort in Dade County. We see benefits to both by doing so. There is a lot of CETA money in Dade County -- almost $5 million for our school system alone -- with more coming.

Ernie (LEA representative)

We have a Dade County Master Plan for Career Education including (a) a K-12 component and (b) a post-secondary/adult component. We have a strong K-eight career awareness program that should help youth when they become YETP eligible during their high school years.

By starting in kindergarten, our goal is to help every student reach a tentative career goal by the 10th grade level.

We are very aware of the potential danger, and criticism, of viewing YETP as "tracking" or "trapping" YETP enrollees into a strictly non-college-bound path. We do much to avoid this danger. Some of our YETP enrollees will attend college.

We believe our "career related courses" in subjects such as mathematics and English hold great potential for combining assurances of providing youth with basic academic competencies along with some specific vocational skills. This approach has already produced evidence that it is effective in raising more of this kind of basic research evidence.

Our biggest single strength, I believe, is the tremendous collaborative working relationships we have established with the business/labor/industry community. That community is really helping to make our efforts successful. We owe them a great deal of whatever credit comes to career education in Dade County.

Questions and Answers

Q - How many YETP-eligible youth are in the Dade County Schools?
A - Probably 10,000. With only $1.2 million for YETP, most of these funds are needed to pay YETP enrollee stipends for 20 hours per week during the school year and 40 hours per week during summers. Our administrative costs are only 4 percent of this contract. We have only three professionals in our YETP program.

Q - How can three professionals serve 337 YETP enrollees?
A - The Dade County schools employs our vocational teacher coordinators at no cost to CETA; these persons help make our YETP effort successful.

Q - Can a YETP enrollee get into cooperative work experience at the 12th grade level without having taken previous courses in vocational education?
A - Yes. If he/she simply enrolls in vocational education during the morning, he/she can participate in YETP work experience in the afternoons.

Q - How do you see the YETP effort tying in with your career education effort?
A - With YETP, we are serving only youth at least 16 years old. We have many 14-15 year olds badly in need of career exploration who could be paid, at least in part, through YETP funds supplemented by our already developed career related courses, made up specifically for Grades seven to nine.

Q - Describe your student evaluation efforts.
A - Every nine weeks, the OJT supervisor sits down with the youth's employer and finds out how he/she is doing. Based on this kind of conversation/observation, the teacher assigns student grades. In addition to our evaluation efforts, our Prime Sponsor monitors our YETP efforts independently.

Q - How does your "YETP Advisory Council" fit with your "Career Education Advisory Council"?
A - Some of the same persons are on both of these advisory councils.

Tom Jacobson - La Mesa, California

Tom (LEA representative)

Too many schools are looking narrowly at the question, "How do we get the CETA dollars?" That should be but a small part of the school system's strategies for external funding. Rather than responding to announcements of possible funding sources as they are discovered, a school district would do much better if previous efforts were devoted to asking the basic question of WHAT DO WE WANT AND NEED TO DO FOR STUDENTS IN OUR SCHOOL DISTRICT? If this question has been asked and answered systematically in a school district planning effort, the school district is then in a much better position to see how CETA, or any other kind of possible external funding, might help the school district attain its goals.

It is very important that the local educator understands the basic difference between a "grant" and a "contract." It MUST be remembered that YETP operates with "contracts," not with "grants." There is a specific "statement of work" involved that must be fulfilled.

CAREER RESOURCE CENTERS - This is a concept largely developed by Tom Jacobson. Much research is available now showing, for example, that if a student visits the "career resource center" five to six times, he/she sees many opportunities in vocational education as well as in other fields. There is clear evidence that enrollment in vocational education doubles for those youth visiting the center five or six times.

We have discovered that the toughest "public relations" problems for YETP lie within the school system, not in the broader community.

Our "YETP curriculum" can be summarized as follows in terms of major elements:

- Self evaluation: assessing interests, aptitudes, values, etc.
- Exploring careers related to the youth's tentative career choices.
- Developing work training stations for YETP youth; work experience is the biggest single emphasis in our YETP program.
- Continuing career guidance and on-site observation at work experience sites leading to placement in unsubsidized employment in the private sector.

In our regular ongoing program we make great use of "career development teachers" who work with youth, in a ratio of 1:125, in developing career goals, supervising work experience, and providing students with group guidance along with some individual counseling.

We do award academic credit for the work experience portion of YETP.

Questions and Answers

Q - How many "career development teachers" do you have in YETP?
A - We have one "career development teacher" in every high school BUT each has about 125 students in his/her regular program. District wide, teachers are taking on an additional 130 YETP enrollees for 15 hours per week, primarily in an after school program (for which they receive extra pay for YETP).

Q - How do you find counselors and "career development teachers" working together?
A - If you house them together in career centers, they work together very well.

Q - What are the requirements to be a "career development teacher"?
A - A teaching certificate plus six semester hours of special study.

Q - How many "career development teachers" do you have for your 130 YETP kids?
A - We have one for every 35 YETP enrollees. These kids need special help so the teacher/pupil ratio must be much lower for them.

Frances Jackson and Mark Bowlds - Helena, Montana

Mark (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our Employment Training Division administers YETP for our Balance of State effort under a subcontract with the Human Resource Development Council, HRDC (the old Community Action Program).

Our in-school YETP effort can be summarized as follows:

- The major focus is on work experience.
- Using the "field learning experience program" of EBCE is the way we have found effective in getting academic credit.
- Eligibility: 14-18 year olds are eligible in our program for work experience (limited to junior and senior high school students only). We also work with out-of-school youth for up to 90 days of work experience aimed at encouraging them to return to high school. If they do not, we switch our efforts with these youth and help them explore other alternatives and refer to Title II B & C programs on PSE.

We have a special YETP effort for school dropouts also (i.e., CRT and OJT). Our local HRDCs work very closely with school counselors in identifying YETP kids.

Our YETP "FIELD LEARNING PROGRAM" is carried out primarily through work experience in a public or private non-prifit setting. We also include in this effort a number of job sampling sites in the private sector. We find there is a fine line between "job sampling" and being "productive for the employer." This is still in the process of being worked out.

Our biggest problems are in "turf battles" with other kinds of programs.

CETA staff -- seven persons for four kinds of CETA programs -- includes one and one half persons specifically for YETP.

Frances (LEA representative)

The "hidden agenda" of schools being suspicious of CETA's intentions with respect to kids has been going on for several years. We decided to take professional educators from two school districts in Montana to engage in intensive study of EBCE as practiced at the Far West Laboratory. Based on what we learned there, we decided to use YETP funds to employ "FIELD LEARNING COORDINATORS." Some HRDC counselors have also been included in this Far West Laboratory EBCE training program.

Our goal was to make the work experience portion of YETP worthy of academic credit. The HRDC counselors are working with our job sites and have been successful in changing conditions in many of them so that they are now a better and a more bona fide learning opportunity for our YETP enrollees.

The YETP effort in Montana varies from school district to school district. In some districts, YETP youth meet with their "FIELD LEARNING COORDINATOR" only once a week, while in other communities they meet with them one hour each day.

Our greatest strength lies in our close liaison with the Governor's Employment and Training Council.

We have one CETA person full-time on our school staff now.

Questions and Answers

Q - How many "FIELD LEARNING COORDINATORS" do you have?
A - One coordinator in each of seven school districts. Each "coordinator" can handle 15-30 youth and each is paid for with YETP funds.

Q - Does the Balance of State Prime Sponsor have a financial or a non-financial agreement with LEAs for YETP programs?
A - It is "financial" insofar as salaries for "FIELD LEARNING COORDINATORS" is concerned. In terms of other YETP services, it is primarily non-financial.

Q - What about your computer based career information center?
A - We have a career information center in each high school using the GIS system. We typically house the GIS system with the librarian rather than with the counselor. It seems to work out best for us to do it this way.

Jerry Jenkins and Tim Haffner - Portsmouth, Ohio

Jerry (LEA representative)

We have about 60,000 persons in our county, which has 11 small high schools and one larger high school. Each of these 12 schools has its own board of education, and this situation causes some problems. We have 54 YETP youth, all in-school 11th and 12th graders.

Each week, after school, we meet these YETP enrollees for three hours. When we first started our YETP effort, we attempted to immediately place each enrollee on the job in a work experience situation. We found our YETP enrollees simply were not ready for this. Their counselors had not prepared them with the basic general employability skills that they needed. As a result, we dropped the "job slot" approach and instead created a class in "career awareness."

This course concentrates primarily on helping students acquire good work habits along with a set of job seeking/getting/holding skills. We have developed student workbooks for use in this course.

We have interpreted "OJT" in YETP to mean strictly private sector experiences.

We have had from one to five YETP enrollees involved in OJT at any given time, but most of our YETP enrollees obtain their work experience in private non-profit settings; there, of course, it is called "career employment experience" instead of "OJT."

We find the class/course approach works best for us. Unless we can help these YETP enrollees gain a better and a more positive understanding of themselves and of their potentials, many are not likely to remain with us through high school.

As a "teacher coordinator," I teach the class. We bring in about 25 youth on Tuesday afternoons, after school. There, we do some private counseling but it is mostly group guidance through the class. The other part of my job is to consult with the YETP enrollees' work supervisors at the job sites where they are gaining their work experience.

The most frustrating part of the job is having to wait until they are 11th graders before we can begin to help them. To try to change, for example, work values beginning at age 16 is a very tough job. We should start much, much earlier. This summer, we are hoping to do a 14-15 year old YETP program.

Tim (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our YETP youth work 15 hours a week, including the three hours they spend in the class that Jerry described. Ninety percent of our YETP youth are working in private, non-profit agencies.

There are two special elements in our YETP effort that deserve mention:

- We send five YETP kids each summer to college, where they can take a course of their choosing.
- We have initiated a pre-apprentice cement mason program for another five of our YETP youth.

The State Employment Service is housed with us in our CETA office. It does the YETP eligibility requirement work for us.

The relationship between the Prime Sponsor and our local Joint Vocational School is very good; it is our greatest strength. We now see each other about four times per week. The two "teacher coordinators" from the JVS and two persons from our CETA staff have divided up the YETP youth so that each of us handles only about 15 of these youth, allowing for more individualized attention.

Questions and Answers

Q - Did you get union approval for the pre-apprentice program you started?
A - Yes.

Q - Are your two "teacher coordinators" both housed at the Joint Vocational School that serves the 12 school districts in your area?
A - Yes. YETP funds are used to transport YETP youth from their individual schools over to the Joint Vocational School so they can take this special course.

FOUR ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to convince school people to award academic credit for YETP participation.
- How to solve the Fiscal Year differences between Prime Sponsors and school districts.
- How to get a valid data base for evaluating YETP efforts in an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.
- How to get SEAs to work positively, rather than negatively, in the YETP effort.

Issue: How to convince school people to award academic credit for YETP participation

Tim: We have established a YETP class for youth that meets three times a week. LEA officials told us that if that class met seven hours a week we could get academic credit for it. We simply cannot do that.

Jerry: I coordinated a career exploration program in YETP that received one fourth of an elective credit. The argument about giving academic credit to YETP disadvantaged students was HOW CAN WE GIVE CREDIT TO ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED FOR COURSES THAT ARE NOT OPEN TO ALL STUDENTS? Our argument back to them was that the LEA should provide, with its own funds, these courses for all students.

Tom: Before YETP came along, we already had 1,500 kids receiving academic credit for their involvement in our work experience program. We saw YETP simply as an extension of that effort. IF academic credit is to be awarded for YETP, then it should be provided for in the "STATEMENT OF WORK" that accompanies the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. Without this, the LEA person responsible for YETP simply looks at all the extra paper work required if academic credit were to be provided. Since it is not in the "STATEMENT OF WORK," he does not want to do this "extra" job and thus contends that academic credit is "unimportant."

Lee: The local LEA YETP coordinator cannot make decisions regarding academic credit even if he/she wants to. Those decisions are made by the superintendent and the board of education. The superintendent has to be convinced that the YETP activity is deserving of academic credit. Our 9th grade YETP participants are now getting one semester hour of social studies credit. Our 11th and 12th graders are now getting one semester hour work study credit for their YETP participation. Our Prime Sponsor has pushed hard for academic credit. Our biggest problem came from inside the LEA itself.

Mark: Before we could get academic credit for YETP, we had to agree to use certificated teachers. When YETP came along, the school system said it simply could not do it with its current staff, who were already overworked. As a result, the Prime Sponsor, as part of the agreement, provided the school system with a staff position and the LEA then employed a certificated teacher to fill it. As a result, our YETP youth now get "elective" credit, BUT not "academic" credit. We, as the Prime Sponsor, are still pushing for "academic" credit -- i.e., for credit that will count toward high school graduation someday. Our rationale for doing so is that SOME OF THESE YOUTH WILL BE HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS AND THEY WILL NEED ALL THE ACADEMIC CREDIT THEY CAN GET.

Alan: "Academic credit" has both process and substance implications. In regard to "substance" the answer obviously lies in talking about competencies to be acquired. If the "process" portion of the question is involved, there is a separate set of issues to be resolved.

Frances: In a full-blown Experience Based Career Education (EBCE) model, students are awarded academic credit for work experience BUT this requires a highly skilled learning coordinator (teacher) who is able to infuse academic content into the work experience. Under our EBCE YETP effort, our YETP youth are given one credit for their YETP work experience and one credit for EBCE. However, if the question is one of giving them credit for, say, English, then they can earn such credit only by taking a course in English from a teacher of English. The YETP emphasis on Public Service Employment, rather than on the private sector, is making it harder to rationally solve the "academic credit" question right now.

Maurice: We started our youth programs in the Dade County Schools with Title I CETA money long before YEDPA legislation had even been enacted. When this new legislation was enacted, we simply saw YETP as an extension of what we were already doing under Title I of CETA. We write an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement -- which is really a contract -- up front that requires YETP youth to (a) meet all academic requirements for high school graduation; and (b) receive one work experience credit for their participation, in the afternoon, in the OJT portion of YETP.

Issue: How to solve the Fiscal Year differences between Prime Sponsors and schools districts

Alan: None of us has any control over the fact that Congress makes annual appropriations, or over the fact the Congress has directed that the Government's Fiscal Year shall start on October 1. Those are givens.

Jerry: LET ME TELL YOU WHAT I, AS A TEACHER PAID BY CETA FUNDS, AM FACED WITH. My contract runs out September 30. If it is not renewed with new YETP money, I am out of a job. In the past, as a regular school district employee, I have been issued a teacher contract each April covering the next school year. As a person now being paid 100 percent from CETA funds, I will not have a regular school district contract like all the other teachers in my school. I took this assignment on because of my interest in and commitment to career education. Right now, I am in a situation where I have to seriously reconsider whether to risk another YETP contract coming through or play it safe and take one of the regular teacher assignments I have been offered. Right now, I do not know what I am going to do. If it were just myself, I would not worry but, with a family, I have to also think of them.

Lee: I have 11 staff persons working in YETP in our school district. My own salary is paid by the school system, but 100 percent of the salaries of these 11 persons comes from CETA funds.

Maurice: Let me give another example. I must hire three people next week but will have to tell each that their jobs may end on September 30. It is very difficult getting the kinds of high quality people we need under these tenuous arrangements.

Maurice In general, school board rules are set up under two arrangements: (a) IF you are a regular school district employee and, in that capacity, accept a CETA assignment under which CETA funds are used to cover your salary, the school system owes you a job somewhere in the school system if and when the CETA funds disappear; BUT (b) if you come into a school district "CETA position" from outside the school system and the CETA program later disappears, you are shut out from any guarantee of further employment by the school district.

Lee: AGREE. Even the regular school district employee has problems here in that, even though the school district has to take him/her back, there can be no guarantee that he/she will be re-assigned in the same school -- let alone to the same position -- that he/she left. In a large county such as ours, this could mean a re-assignment that is 80 miles away from the former one.

Ernie: AS ONE POSSIBLE STRATEGY FOR SOLVING THE PROBLEM, a good bet might be to take this problem to the teachers union and make it a bargaining point for the union to use in dealing with the school board.

Tom: It would probably go against you if you tried that. In these times, the union would probably lose to the school board on that issue.

Tom: This problem is one that is easier to solve in large school districts than in smaller ones. In the very large school district, there is flexibility to transfer 50-100 (or even more) employees each year somewhere within the district. The small school district does not have this kind of flexibility. IF THIS PROBLEM IS NOT SOLVED, we run the risk of eventually finding that only the large school districts will be participating in YETP LEA/PRIME SPONSOR AGREEMENTS and smaller school districts will elect not to participate.

Tom: POSSIBLE STRATEGY FOR SOLVING THE PROBLEM - Knowing that the Federal money becomes available each year on October 1, why could we not move the RFP process back a few months so that the contract can be awarded, say, in June even though it is not due to go into effect until October 1 -- with a clear understanding on both sides that, if Congress fails to appropriate funds, the contract is null and void? JUST MOVING THE RFP PROCESS BACK A FEW MONTHS WOULD HELP GREATLY.

Maurice: This would not help in settings where the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement involves a consortium of local school districts. Some members of the consortium might well resist. Some of our communities do not get any kind of word from the Regional Administrator's office of the Department of Labor until late in the year, so local Prime Sponsors cannot begin the contracting process.

Mark: The new CETA law says rules and regulations have to be set by April and that, by May 15 of each year, the allocation of funds to each Prime Sponsor has to be known.

Tom: Any Prime Sponsor has a pretty good idea of what money will be available for the next Fiscal Year, at least within a range. Usually, it can expect conservatively at least 90 percent as much as it received last year.

Allan: We do not use the RFP route in dealing with the school system in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements. Instead, we consider it under a "sole source contract" arrangement. In addition, we have other ways of making things easier. For example, this year we have provided money in our current budget to cover start-up costs in the 1979-80 academic year operations.

Issue: How to get a valid data base for evaluating YETP efforts in an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement

Tom: We submitted a SPEDY proposal for next summer and it rated high. We received $325 per student for this effort. San Diego City, on the other hand, received only $95 per student for its SPEDY program to start this summer. When questions were raised regarding this per-student cost difference, they had to be answered in terms of QUALITY OF SERVICES, not just in terms of PER PUPIL COSTS. The clear implication is that evaluation should take place. At the same time, when you look at YETP rules and regulations, there is nothing there with respect to evaluation of LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement program efforts. Most other Federal programs provide anywhere from five to seven percent of the costs for evaluation of the effort. This is a weakness of YETP at present. WHAT WE NEED IS A COOKBOOK, "HOW TO EVALUATE A YETP EFFORT."

Ernie: At a recent conference, I heard the Chief of Program Review and Evaluation for CETA make a speech. He said the initial early objective of YEDPA was primarily centered on "economic benefits," BUT as of now the "name of the game" is LONGITUDINAL DATA THAT WILL PROVIDE GUIDELINES FOR FUTURE SPENDING. He further said that people will be asked to use measurable objectives for their YETP efforts and evaluate against those objectives. Finally, he indicated that YEDPA will be seeking contracts with organizations aimed at developing appropriate instruments for use in evaluating YETP programs.

Alan: YEDPA has already recognized past CETA weaknesses in evaluation. The whole YEDPA operation, unlike CETA in general, has been built from a KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT perspective. Everyone had to do a year-end report last year that was supposed to reflect this emphasis.

Tim: As part of our Prime Sponsor agreement with the Department of Labor, we had a third party evaluation for all of our CETA programs. In terms of YETP evaluation, the evaluators looked at criteria such as "number of job placements" as well as process criteria regarding how YETP was carried out.

Tom: Do not mix up "monitoring" with "evaluation." True, YETP has been "monitored," but this does not mean it has been "evaluated."

Maurice: The Prime Sponsor is primarily interested in "monitoring" -- i.e., in having assurances that the school district lives up to each requirement in the contract. How would you evaluate "transition services" in a YETP effort?

Tom: I would concentrate on getting measures for each of the general employability skills called for in "transition services," putting those skills in a YETP curriculum, and then measuring for them after applying the YETP treatment.

Ernie: I would develop measures around expected YETP learner outcomes. For example, did students stay in high school, as YETP is trying to encourage them to do?

Alan: There are three basic ways of looking at the evaluation question:

(1) Compliance monitoring
(2) Outcome monitoring
(3) Impact evaluation (e.g., followup).

Lee: In one of our YETP contracts, we have written in provisions for a six-month followup of YETP seniors after they leave school (hopefully) for work.

Ernie: One criterion that would be meaningful is "did these students get salary increases -- *i.e.*, did they move up in the occupational society once they got in it. In other words, was YETP successful in avoiding the danger of placing students in what become "dead end" jobs?

Alan: The Department of Labor gives no Prime Sponsor *any* incentive to do *any* impact evaluations.

Ernie: The "cookbook" approach to evaluating general employability skills used in career education (*i.e.*, basic academic skills, good work habits, work values, decision making skills, job seeking/getting/holding skills, etc.) would have *direct* applicability to evaluating "transition services" in YETP.

Alan: The Department of Labor would say that situations are sufficiently different around the nation that *any* "cookbook" approach to evaluation would be resisted by CETA Prime Sponsors.

Mark: AGREE. The Prime Sponsor would resist, in part, because of fear that a generalized approach to evaluation would shortly be translated into still more YETP rules and regulations, thus further restricting the freedom to respond to local conditions that is the "life blood" for any local CETA Prime Sponsor.

Maurice: The Prime Sponsor would also resist because most have a number of CBOs that must, for political reasons, be funded but which, if they were subjected to a sound evaluation, would turn out looking very bad.

Mark: Prime Sponsors *would not* resist a "cookbook" if it was put out as a voluntary "technical assistance" item rather than as a CETA *requirement*. On the contrary, they would *welcome* a document such as "GUIDE TO EVALUATION OF YETP TRANSITION SERVICES."

Idea: Consider combining the current OCE project with the College Entrance Examination Board on "evaluation of career education" into a publication that could be used at this summer's ten regional conferences on "YETP and Career Education."

Frances: From the standpoint of the Prime Sponsor, if a request for proposal comes out that requires a school district to describe how it plans to evaluate its YETP efforts, the school district *should* be able to respond. BUT the cost of doing so would have to be reflected in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

Alan: If this were done, the Prime Sponsor would have to require a third party evaluator. That is, no subcontractor (such as a school district) should be responsible for evaluating its own efforts.

Tim: I like Frances' idea and would like to see this happen.

Mark: In effect, we are doing it now. The Far West Laboratory *is* serving as our third party evaluator.

Tom: If you teach the LEAs how to do the evaluation, you should either trust them to do it or, if you feel you cannot, you should not give them the contract. The requirement for "third party evaluators" has been a "rip off" in many cases.

Ernie: AGREE WITH TOM. Evaluation ought to be viewed as a management tool for program improvement. To work this way, the LEA should do its own evaluation.

Alan: NO, that is "process monitoring," not "impact evaluation."

CONSENSUS: A general "cookbook" guide to evaluation of YETP would be welcomed by CETA Prime Sponsors and by LEAs so long as it is not required. It should be produced and distributed to both.

Issue: How to get SEAs to work positively, rather than negatively, in the YETP effort

Frances: Many SEAs want to "skim" dollars off the top from the YETP funds. Still, SEA positive leadership efforts for YETP have generally been minimal at best. At present, there are many LEAs that know more about YETP and about LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements than do their SEAs. There have been, in some instances, situations where LEAs have received letters from their SEAs warning them that, if they sign an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement with a Prime Sponsor without going through the SEA, they run the risk of having *all* Federal funds to the LEA channeled through the SEA cut off.

Mark: We experienced some difficulties in working with our SEA and decided that, as a Prime Sponsor, it would be better to work directly with LEAs. We have been told by the SEA that we cannot deal with LEAs unless we go through the SEA.

Maurice: The SEA gets funds under Section 112 of what is now Title II-B of CETA which, is earmarked for the Vocational Education Division of the SEA. This is the famous so-called "six percent money." The State Director of Vocational Education then allocates these funds, on a project basis, to the LEAs. Such funds are to be used primarily to provide both specific vocational skill training and transition services to out-of-school youth and adults through vocational education facilities.

A serious problem arises when an LEA vocational education person's salary is paid 100 percent out of this "6 percent money" and the person receiving such a salary becomes interested and involved in other kinds of CETA programs, such as those in Title IV - YOUTH PROGRAMS. Some SEAs say that, if your salary comes entirely from Title II-B of CETA, you should engage in no CETA activities carried out through other titles.

Alan: That is now being corrected. By April 1, all administrative costs to a particular agency (such as an LEA) paid for by CETA are to be combined, no matter how many grants or contracts are involved for the various CETA titles.

Gene: There are two basic problems now: (a) SEAs are divided into two camps -- i.e., those serving vocational education vs. those serving all other parts of education. Both are going to CETA Prime Sponsors and saying "give all the CETA money to me." (b) How best to combine CETA administrative costs from various CETA titles in a single school district.

Tom: In California, the problem is not at the SEA level. There, people have their act together and are putting on a good "road show" now to help LEAs.

Walter: There is an apparent need for Department of Education people to get together more frequently and more effectively with State Boards of Education.

Mark: As a Balance of State CETA operation, we have quite a bit of control over the "six percent money." This "six percent money" is not for YETP. There is no point talking about the topic of "YETP AND THE SIX PERCENT MONEY," because it is a false, non-existent topic.

Gene: AGREE. YETP is for in-school youth while the "six percent money" is for out-of-school youth and adults. It is NOT something to mix together.

Frances: There is nothing in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement that calls for an SEA "sign-off."

Gene: For Balance of State Prime Sponsors, the SEA will legitimately become involved. The LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements for Balance of State go through the SEA which, in turn, makes funds to LEAs for the six percent money, but not for the YETP money.

Mark: In Montana, we use the "six percent money" for vocational-technical training plus all transition services and support services for out-of-school youth and adults.

Gene: That is right. For in-school youth, we count on vocational education funds to pay for specific vocational skill training and YETP funds to provide transition/support services for economically disadvantaged in-school youth -- both those enrolled in vocational education and those enrolled in other programs. THE "SIX PERCENT MONEY" IS USED, FOR OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH AND ADULTS, TO PAY BOTH FOR VOCATIONAL SKILL TRAINING AND FOR TRANSITION/SUPPORT SERVICES.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 119

LEA/CETA Agreements for More Than 22 Percent of YETP Funds

March 20 and 21, 1979.

Participants

Mr. Walter M. Kearney
Project Coordinator
Youth Employment Demonstration Project
Old Howard High School
Wilmington, Delaware

Mr. Sherman Crisden
Manpower Youth Planner
City-County Building
Wilmington, Delaware

Mr. Conway Knighton
Youth Coordinator
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Mr. Leo A. Turner
Executive Director for
the Mayor's
Office of Employment
and Training
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Mr. Samuel W. Mendelson
Coordinator of Compensatory Programs
Somerville Public Schools
Somerville, New Jersey

Ms. Dana B. Little
CETA Youth Programs
Supervisor
Somerville, New Jersey

Mr. Gary L. Tuck
Youth Employment Coordinator
City of Portland Schools
Portland, Oregon

Mr. Robert Struble
Youth Program Planner
Human Resources Bureau
Portland, Oregon

Mr. Gordon Roff
Program Manager
Seattle Public Schools Work
Training Program
Seattle, Washington

Mr. Stan Eccles
Supervisor, In-School
Programs
Seattle, Washington

Observer

Mr. Jack D. Ford
Assistant Director
Career Development Service
State Department of Education
Division of Vocational Education
Columbus, Ohio

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How can a YETP effort attract enough eligible 16-19 year old youth in a community with a strong YIEP program?

2. How can a YETP effort for 14-15 year olds best meet the placement criterion with quality jobs?

3. How can the necessity for busing of students to school be overcome in terms of finding enough time for YETP youth to work 15 hours per week?

4. How can a job bank be developed that can be used in short lead time situations?

5. How to get LEAs to make commitments to YETP as a condition for getting YETP funds.

6. How to get a unified YETP plan when the Prime Sponsor has to deal with a large number of small school districts.

7. How to get a common monitoring system for YETP when more that one Prime Sponsor is involved.

8. How to develop and use a project evaluation approach that starts at the beginning rather than at the end of the YETP project.

9. How to get agreement on interpretation of YETP rules and regulations.

10. How to get closer, more direct relationships between LEAs and Prime Sponsors that will encourage mutual accountability.

11. How to avoid job placement overlap in efforts of LEAs and efforts of Prime Sponsors.

12. How to highlight youth activities as a part of YETP through using existing models such as Vocational Instructional Clubs of America (VICA).

13. How to solve the transportation problem for economically disadvantaged YETP youth.

14. How to get an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement written in specific enough form that it does not depend on personal working relationships between top LEA and CETA administrators.

15. What are the basic components of a good LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement?

16. How to get adequate lead time for planning YETP efforts.

17. How to increase evaluation efforts in YETP.

18. How to maintain a Title II-B effort for "x" number of youth when, with costs going up, we have to settle for low cost in-school efforts rather than things more needed but which would be more costly.

19. How does YETP impact on and relate to other CETA programs?

20. How to plan for making maximum use of State vocational education funds, education funds, and CETA funds to best serve all economically disadvantaged youth in a coordinated effort.

21. How to best coordinate financial agreements with existing vocational education programs.

22. How to best carry out training and supervision of job site location supervisors.

23. How to integrate YETP goals and guidelines with career education guidelines and curriculum.

24. How to get a stronger LEA/Prime Sponsor link in terms of YETP efforts for out-of-school youth.

25. How to get academic credit for work experience, in addition to giving credit for in-school YETP activities.

26. How to overcome LEA restrictions that are preventing some LEAs from participating fully in the eligibility validation of YETP youth.

27. How to best meet both the QUALITY and the QUANTITY requirements of YETP.

28. How to educate LEA personnel about YETP.

29. How to solve differences in LEA/CETA Fiscal Year periods.

30. How to best use LEA personnel employed part-time in YETP.

31. What to do with youth in need of YETP who do not meet the "economically disadvantaged" criteria?

32. How to get the LEA to share personnel with the Prime Sponsor to the degree required to really make YETP work.

33. How to cut down on LEA demands for overhead funds needed in YETP.

34. How to encourage LEAs to do a better job in providing pre-employment experiences to YETP eligible youth.

35. How to encourage LEAs to use CETA Prime Sponsors as a referral resource for in-school youth with career/personal problems.

36. How to get LEAs to keep up with the paper work required under YETP.

37. How to help LEAs get over their paranoia about evaluation of their efforts.

38. How to make the LEA counselors an asset rather than a liability to YETP.

39. How to solve the job site selection problem in YETP.

40. How to encourage YETP youth to recognize the career development benefits -- in addition to the obvious economic benefits -- that come from YETP participation.

41. How to discourage youth from dropping out of high school so they can become eligible for YETP GED efforts.

42. How to meet needs of handicapped persons in YETP.

43. How to install YETP selectively in a quality way rather than spreading a little bit over all school districts -- with a result that none gets really adequate help.

44. How to get special kinds of teacher contracts that will be more useful in various kinds of Federal programs, rather than being limited to typical LEA hiring procedures and working conditions.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Conway Knighton and Leo Turner - Baton Rouge, Lousiana

Leo (Prime sponsor representative)

Baton Rouge has about 350,000 people, and a 6.5 percent unemployment rate.

In the current $535,000 YETP effort, there is a YETP staff of 25 persons who, among them, operate the following kinds of programs:

- "Youth Tutoring Youth" Program - 25 YETP enrollees
- Work Experience - 40 YETP enrollees
- GED - 30 YETP enrollees
- In-school Career Experience - 45 YETP enrollees
- Upward Bound - 12 YETP enrollees

NOTE: At any given time, there are about 152 YETP enrollees in the program, with a total of about 350 YETP youth served during any given year.

We have a centralized intake office for all of CETA located in our "GENERAL EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING SERVICES OFFICE." YETP is also handled here. Once the school system certifies a youth as "YETP-eligible," we do a complete intake in this CETA office to make sure the youth is CETA-eligible.

We are using COTS (Comprehensive Occupational Training Services), a 2-3 day work sample testing program with 10 different testing stations.

Individual YETP enrollees must sign the same kind of grievance forms that are required of any other CETA enrollee.

We have a full-time JOB PLACEMENT SPECIALIST charged with developing unsubsidized jobs in the public and private sectors for our YETP completers.

Conway (LEA representative)

Of a total of about $535,000 YETP funds, $280,000 goes for use in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement -- considerably more than the 22 percent minimum. A majority of these funds is used for YETP youth wages, NOT to subsidize staff positions in the LEA.

Our YETP in-school program includes both an industrial crafts program (essentially a cooperative education arrangement) and an IN-SCHOOL COLLEGE PROGRAM (for YETP-eligible youth who are college bound).

In spite of our signed LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement, we maintain the right, as the Prime Sponsor, to cancel any YETP program that does not work well or cannot provide good evaluation data. We do not have to live with the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement for a full year. As a result, the LEA is doing much better.

Our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement (contract) spells out each program the LEA will operate, saying exactly what will be done in each program.

We insist that each work site supervisor keep good statistics on those YETP youth he/she supervises.

In our "YOUTH TUTORING YOUTH" program, the "tutors" are YETP enrollees. We give these "tutors" special training during the summer so they can, in fact, work with classroom teachers during the following school year for up to two hours per day.

Our GED program has two classes: (a) a class aimed at getting the GED; and (b) a class to increase literacy level (for those who cannot pass the GED). When students exit from our GED program, we make them aware of other CETA services available to them.

Our WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM is geared primarily for out-of-school youth.

Questions and Answers

Q - How does your YETP screening by the LEA work?
A - Our CETA intake office actually determines eligibility. However, the school counselors recommend kids to us who they think are eligible.

Q - Tell us about your "IN-SCHOOL CAREER EXPERIENCE PROGRAM."
A - The "industrial craft program" portion is basically a cooperative education program -- one half day of school and one half day at work -- set up in various building trades. I have already told you about our "in-school college program." Finally, we have some "transition services" but are doing very little in that area at the present time.

Q - Is the Mayor's Office the CETA Prime Sponsor?
A - Yes. The "Office of Employment and Training," where I work, is in the Mayor's office. We have an LEA person as Chairman of our Advisory Council, which makes things work well for us.

Q - Are all your YETP enrollees economically disadvantaged?
A - Yes.

Q - Are your GED students paid?
A - Yes. They are paid an "allowance," not a "wage."

Q - Is your YOUTH TUTORING YOUTH program a part of Judge Mary Kohler's model?

A - No, it is a local thing. The tutors are YETP enrollees and receive stipends. Those they tutor are not YETP enrollees. They are simply kids who are having problems in school. This program takes place primarily after school.

Sam Mendelson and Dana Little - Somerville, New Jersey

Sam (LEA representative)

In FY 78, the Somerville LEA got $42,000. This amount was used, in part, to pay the full salary of a "career counselor" who had responsibility for starting the YETP program. Other parts of these monies were used for establishing a career resource center, and still other parts are for youth salaries. This year we have $69,000, most of which is being used to pay YETP youth salaries. Only one half of the career counselor's salary is coming from these funds.

"Transition services" offered under YETP include: vocational and skill training, career orientation, OJT, and career planning seminars.

The YETP "career counselor" does initial eligibility screening of YETP youth. She also does our job site searches.

Our "career planning seminars" are held periodically throughout the school year. We are using our English and business education classes to present our "career awareness units." Eighty-five percent of the YETP participants are in these classes.

Our "career counselor" also coordinates activities for those YETP youth who will be going into the summer SPEDY program.

We in the LEA have meetings with CETA people one or two times per month now. At the beginning, we met much more often.

We have no objective evaluations yet, but subjective judgments lead us to say: YETP enrollees have shown improvement in grades; YETP enrollees' attitudes have improved; and YETP enrollees now find school more meaningful to them.

Major problems we are currently experiencing include: the large amount of required documentation and paper work, monitoring requirements for YETP, gaining necessary LEA/CETA mutual understandings regarding one another, and academic credit. (We are going to try to obtain academic credit by developing a "minicourse" for YETP enrollees.)

Dana (Prime Sponsor representative)

On my CETA staff, I have both "in-school coordinators" and "out-of-school coordinators" for YETP.

We have YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements with three of our local school districts, each of which responded successfully to an RFP we issued.

Our YETP intake process is decentralized. In our regular CETA programs, it is done by CETA counselors. For our in-school programs, we do intake through our contracts with each LEA. We have an "outreach counselor" funded in each LEA. After initial screening, the "outreach counselor" sends data to our "in-school coordinator." Then the data goes through a selection committee, composed of a combination of LEA and CETA persons, which makes the final selection of YETP enrollees.

An employability plan is developed for each YETP enrollee by our "in-school coordinator." This is then used in developing and matching job sites for each YETP enrollee.

We have put specific LEA responsibilities in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. In our contract with our county vocational-technical school, these responsibilities include:

- Orientation for YETP enrollees, lasting three classroom hours;
- A "CAREER ORIENTATION WORKSHOP," which occupies three hours of the 15 hours per week the YETP enrollee works. This workshop includes attention to such things as career exploration, work attitudes, and development of job seeking/getting/holding skills;
- A plan for placement, usually within the school itself;
- A "PEER GUIDANCE PROGRAM" conducted, under a model developed in Houston, Texas, on a group guidance basis for about 15 youth at a time. These youth are given information about a hypothetical company and then role play the "personnel committee" for this company. The youth are asked to make company "policy statements" concerning ways they would handle a variety of kinds of employability/employment problems that are presented to them.

We have an in-school YETP allotment of 84 youth to spread over the three districts.

Counseling - In each of the three LEAs, we have both on-site and off-site counseling, including monthly review of YETP enrollee plans. "On-site" counseling takes place at the work experience site.

School attendance - We have a rule that, if the YETP enrollee is not present in school on a particular day, he/she is not allowed to work at the YETP job site that day. If a YETP enrollee is having trouble in keeping up with school work, we can take him/her off the work experience portion of YETP and put him/her into "transition services" only, thus providing the youth with more time for study in school.

Questions and Answers

Q - What percent of your in-school and out-of-school youth are being served in YETP?
A - Our YETP enrollees are now 100 percent in-school youth. We now fund our out-of-school youth program entirely under Title II-B of CETA.

Q - What kinds of persons do you have on your YETP paid staff?
A - We fund: (a) the CETA youth supervisor; (b) the in-school coordinator; (c) the out-of-school coordinator; and (d) clerical personnel -- PLUS a "youth coordinator" in each of the three LEAs, PLUS an additional counselor in the LEA that is our county vocational-technical school.

Q - Why did you pick the three LEAs you did and ignore the others?
A - They were the best of those LEAs responding to our RFP.

Q - Right now, what percent of the YETP funds under your LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement are being used for (a) staff salaries and (b) YETP youth salaries?
A - More than 65 percent is currently being used for youth stipends.

Q - Are all of your YETP funds being used for the three contracts you have with LEAs?
A - Yes. The LEAs get 100 percent of our YETP funds (not just the minimum 22 percent).

Q - Are you paying 100 percent of the salaries of the "youth coordinators" in each of the three LEAs with which you have agreements?
A - No. It varies from LEA to LEA. In one of them, 100 percent of the salary is paid; in others, it is only a portion of that salary.

Gary Tuck and Bob Struble - Portland, Oregon

Gary (LEA representative)

We have a decentralized system. Our efforts are aimed at integrating YETP into the total school system.

We have both financial and non-financial agreements between CETA and the school system. Our "non-financial agreement" was in force some time before YETP came into existence. Under these "non-financial agreements," each LEA work experience coordinator handles intake, supervision, and followup of CETA youth. Approximately $25,000 - $50,000 is available for use in each school. While the work experience coordinator does not actually have this money to spend, he/she does have the power to allocate it. A total of $300,000 - $400,000 per year is involved in the "non-financial agreement."

Because of CETA regulations and school district education goals, we felt the need for a common career development plan. It was jointly developed by school work experience coordinators and counselors with CETA managers and counselors. We now have a uniform plan being used for non-CETA as well as for CETA youth in the Portland public schools.

Our "financial agreements" also amount to between $300,000 - $400,000 per year, with about one half coming from YETP and the other one half from Title II-B. Using these funds, four CETA special projects were developed and maintained this year.

Bob (Prime Sponsor representative)

We have five area CETA offices in Portland. In each office, we have four CETA staff persons for youth programs.

Our two major youth funding sources are YETP and Title II-B.

We contract out about 30 percent of our funds in special youth programs (like a career research facility, a career exploration effort, a Black Education Center, etc. -- special areas of importance affecting youth programs).

Eventually, our out-of-school youth will go through a central intake system. However, our in-school YETP youth will continue to go through LEA work experience coordinators for initial intake.

We have six different Department of Labor sources of funding for youth plus some city general funds. These "city general funds" were allocated to us for use in meeting needs of youth who, while poor, do not quite meet CETA eligibility criteria.

We have one of the YETP "10 percent efforts" -- the experimental program for youth from ALL levels of socio-economic background. In this experimental program, we are matching an "over-income youth" side by side in the same job site with a "YETP-eligible youth." We will compare them at the end of the year on a number of criteria. We are using both in-school and out-of-school youth in this experiment. About 100 youth are involved in all.

Portland was one of five cities to get a "YOUTH IN JOBS" program, a discretionary YETP program being evaluated by a research center from St. Louis. All youth in this program have to be out-of-school YETP-eligible youth.

We fund our eight youth special projects both under YETP and under Title II-B.

We are trying to phase out our emphasis on work experience. We are now interested in increasing our private sector involvement. This means we have to give the school system more dollars. That is, we can serve a youth through in-school "work experience" for only about $150 per youth; but, with the private sector OJT approach, the cost comes to $1,500 - $1,700 per youth. This OJT effort is primarily for out-of-school youth. It is simply too expensive to do very much of it for in-school youth.

Questions and Answers

Q - When you got your "city general funds," were you going to the more affluent schools in your LEA district?
A - Our "city general funds" are primarily for out-of-school youth; they are distributed to all areas of the city, with more going to low income areas.

Q - Did you tell these "city general fund" kids they were a part of YETP?
A - No. It was really a work experience program for them.

Q - What do you do for YETP in-school youth over and beyond work experience?
A - It varies from school to school. For example, in one high school, we have an OJT effort with the private sector; in another, we have a career exploration effort for youth in grades seven to 12 who are YETP-eligible. Drawing from several schools, we also have a program of emergency home repair.

Q - Do you have a waiting list of YETP-eligible youth?
A - Yes, for in-school youth. We do not have a "waiting list" for out-of-school youth currently, but we normally do in high poverty areas.

Q - In your "10 percent project," are you paying wages to non-YETP eligible youth?
A - Yes, BUT these kids are close to the poverty level.

Q - What percent of your YETP dollars do you get for overhead in the LEA?
A - Overhead comes only with our "financial contracts," and this amounts to 4.99 percent. All "transition services" for YETP are simply a part of the LEA's regular career education program. Half of Gary's salary is paid for by YETP. In addition, there are eight other LEA persons whose salaries are paid by some combination of YETP and Title II-B funds. These persons work in the four special projects.

Q - What percent of your YETP funds go for wages of youth?
A - About half to three quarters in special projects and 100 percent of monies available under the non-financial agreements.

Q - Do you have PSE employees assigned to your YETP program?
A - No, not for 1980. We have had previously, however.

Bill Kearney and Sherman Crisden - Wilmington, Delaware

Bill (LEA representative)

We started in May, 1978, using funds available through the five percent Governor's discretionary funds, a "YOUTH EMPLOYMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT" (YEDP). Our first effort had to finish by September 30. We are now in our second year.

Our YEDP is established to serve 300 youth in nine high schools. It provides these youth with intensive counseling, career information, placement, and career development (Note: not just "job" development) that leads to employment.

The youth we are established to serve are dropout-prone youth lacking in basic motivation. There are eight staff persons involved: four and a half counselors and three and a half job developers.

We have had great success in making the YETP "paycheck" a secondary objective for participating youth. We spend 80 percent of our initial effort in counseling, to help each youth develop: (a) a better self concept, (b) better self-motivation, and (c) increased willingness and ability to accept responsibility. We operate, in effect, by making a "contract" with each of these youth under which they all have to agree to try to help themselves.

Our participants are, by and large, 18-19 year old youth.

We have a well prepared professional counseling staff, and each participant is scheduled for intensive counseling throughout the project.

Among the 300 students we serve, 200 are in-school seniors. The 100 "others" include, for example, 20 handicapped, 15 juvenile offenders, 25 school dropouts, and 30 Hispanic youth.

There are nine program segments involved: screening and orientation, testing (we use the ACT "Career Planning Program"), interest interpretation, career counseling, job readiness, career exploration, skills training, placement, and follow-up. We follow-up each YETP kid for one full year; this is a very good "plus" for the employers of these youth.

From 75 to 80 percent of our contacts, including job placement, are now being made in the private sector.

As a result of our YEDP effort, the Governor has initiated a "JOBS FOR DELAWARE GRADUATES" program aimed at reaching every high school senior in Delaware. Of the initial $8 million required for this Statewide program, over $4 million has already been raised.

Sherm (Prime Sponsor representative)

YEDP represents about 67 percent of our YETP budget of $317,000-plus.

The Wilmington CETA does not fund 100 percent of any YETP program. Youth Employment Demonstration Project (YEDP) gets 55 percent of its total funding from us and 45 percent of its funding from New Castle County CETA, while the Career Education Program (CEP) gets 21.5 percent of its funding from us and 79.5 percent from New Castle County CETA.

Wilmington's CETA program limits its efforts mostly to economically disadvantaged high school seniors and some juniors.

YETP funds are used to pay 21.5 percent of the costs of our Career Exploration Program, a program run for us by a division of the United Way (Community Service Division of the AFL-CIO). Approximately 68 percent of the participants in this program are in school. It is a program that provides 20 hours per week for in-school youth in career exploration experiences during the school year and 50 hours per week during the summer months. Each youth in this program is able to choose from three different types of (hands-on) career exploration experiences, each of which lasts for varied lengths of time. The out-of-school youth in this program are paid for 40 hours per week. In addition to career exploration experiences, other traditional transition services are offered.

Questions and Answers

Q - Are your CAREER EXPLORATION PROGRAM sites all in the public sector?
A - No. Many are in the private sector.

Q - Are your CAREER EXPLORATION PROGRAM youth paid an "allowance" or a "wage"?
A - It is an "allowance" of $2.90 per hour.

Q - Are your in-school YETP youth paid?
A - Only for the job sampling experience segment of the program.

Q - What do you do about the basic requirement that mandates 65 percent of YETP funds go for youth wages?
A - Section 97.631 of the youth regulations under YCCIP does require a 65 percent limitation of funds for participant wages and benefits; however, YETP regulations do not have such a limitation.

Gordon Roff and Stan Eccles - Seattle, Washington

Stan (Prime Sponsor representative)

In our consortium, we have four divisions. In one of these is a "Youth Unit." This unit has six professional persons plus support staff and is responsible for contracting, technical assistance, and monitoring of our CETA youth programs.

We contract ALL of our programs -- YETP, YCCIP, SPEDY, etc. We spend about $28 million in all, excluding our Title II-B money.

We have six program agents for our three-county area, one in each county for "in-school youth" and one in each county for "out-of-school" youth. Seattle gets 40-50 percent of the funds; King County gets 30-40 percent; and Snohomish County gets about 30 percent. These six "program agents" are all experienced professional persons who had been in their positions for some time before YETP came along.

Gordon (LEA representative)

Seattle schools were among the first schools in the nation to get NYC programs started back in 1965. Thus, we have lots of experience in YETP-type of work.

We have commingled our YIEP and our YETP efforts; there are about 75 total staff involved in the whole operation, including our Tier I YIEP effort.

We operate with different program sections -- e.g., an "intake operations section," an "enrollee services section," etc.

Each of our staff persons has a case load of about 60 enrollees and operates primarily at the work site. The staff is asked to maintain comprehensive records of work site experiences for YETP enrollees, including enrollee time sheets which can be checked every two weeks. (NOTE: We look suspiciously at these time sheets if they show the same hours worked each day; we suspect that either the youth has made a "deal" with the supervisor or the supervisor does not care.)

We have developed our work stations over a number of years. Very few of them are located within the school system.

We get our YETP enrollees: (a) entry into Upward Bound; (b) help in getting things like BEOG grants; (c) help in gaining admittance to postsecondary education institutions; (d) information on medical and dental resources available; etc.

Each enrollee gets one credit toward high school graduation for each 200 hours spent in the work experience program under YETP.

We are doing workshops, in addition, for YETP enrollees in "life skills."

We have a 27 percent overhead. The school district does provide some in-kind services.

We are unique in that, while we are in a school building, it is not a "regular" school building. Our primary emphasis is on the job station, NOT on time spent in "regular" schools. Our prime time with YETP enrollees is from 2:00 - 5:00 p.m., after they have left their "regular" schools.

Questions and Answers

Q - Can you develop YIEP jobs in the private sector? If so, why would YETP participants have trouble finding PSE jobs?

A - Given enough time, we could do more PSE jobs, BUT we have not yet had time to develop enough private sector jobs for our YIEP youth. As a result, they are taking up a lot of our PSE job slots. As soon as one of our YETP youth becomes 16, we immediately move him/her into the YIEP program, because we need to use the YIEP money.

Q - Are your YETP youth all 14-15 year old enrollees?

A - Yes. It is basically a work experience program for these enrollees.

Q - Are the "regular" high schools raising questions about why you are not doing more with YETP-eligible youth within the "regular" high school?

A - No. There is no kind of coordinating mechanism there now. We have lost our work experience staff in the regular high schools, and our present counselors are overloaded without YETP. There is concern for some kind of comprehensive YETP-like program in our "regular" high schools; but in these times of tight school district funds and declining enrollments, it is tough to do much about it.

Q - Are you (Gordon) paid by the school district?

A - Yes.

Q - What percent of your CETA job slots are in the private sector now (for YIEP & YETP)?

A - About 15 percent.

Q - Why do you put all YETP kids in YIEP when they reach age 16?

A - Because we have so much YIEP money, we have to do this.

Q - What are you doing with your CETA Title II-B money?

A - It is being used primarily for 18-21 year old out-of-school youth and for school dropouts.

TWO ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to best carry out training and supervision of job site location supervisors, and how to select the best job sites.
- How to plan for making maximum use of State vocational education funds, career education funds, and CETA funds to best serve all economically disadvantaged youth in a coordinated effort.

Issue: How to best carry out training and supervision of job site location supervisors, and how to select the best job sites

Dana: We do not have as much trouble training professional persons to serve as job site location supervisors as we do when we try to use nonprofessional persons -- for example, maintenance people. Some supervisors are more worried about getting their work done than they are about giving the YETP youth a good training situation.

Bill: There is an implication that CETA is a "boondoggle." We have to get *employers* to be supporters of YETP before we can expect to get adequate job site supervision. The DuPont Corporation actually assigned one of its community relations specialists to study CETA around the nation so he could develop better acceptance of CETA within the DuPont Corporation.

Gary: There are two different problems involved: (a) in-school YETP supervisors and (b) PSE and/or private sector supervisors.

Sam: AGREE. As a job site supervisor of one in-school YETP enrollee myself, I know I can help YETP youth in terms of developing general employability skills, BUT I do not have the expertise to teach him/her some of the specific vocational skills needed on the job. The reverse might well be true for a person from a PSE or private sector setting.

Conway: We seek proposals that include a job description of what the YETP participant will be doing. When the CETA monitor goes out to the job site, he/she looks to see if that is what is actually being done. Thus, we do this from a *planning* perspective. We also include requirements that say whether the job site supervisor will be paid or unpaid. We try to get across to employers the notion that "WE ARE *LOANING* THIS YETP YOUTH TO YOU SO THAT *YOU* CAN PROVIDE HIM/HER WITH NEEDED TRAINING."

Dana: Work site agreements are very important, BUT sometimes those who *negotiate* the agreements are not necessarily those who follow through to see if the agreements are being followed. This can lead to misunderstandings and lack of communication.

Gordon: AGREE. We have a job development section in our intake unit. It does the first negotiation and write-up. We solve this problem by sending case workers out into the field to develop a working relationship with the actual work location supervisor. We also try to help the work location supervisors through an OJT approach of really working with them, as they try to work with YETP youth. We even have a set of materials for these supervisors, to help them do a better job. In addition, we have a "hot line" so that supervisors can call in problems to us and we can respond quickly. We think of the job location supervisor as a kind of "para-professional counselor" -- in this sense, a kind of extension of our own staff. We also try not to put too many youth with one "work location supervisor." Usually, a ratio of 1:2 is about right. Some potential supervisors are really negative persons; we need to identify them and weed them out.

Dana: How do you select "proper" work location supervisors?

Gordon: We look for altruistic persons who really want to help economically disadvantaged youth. It is more a matter of attitude than knowledge.

Leo: Selection of the work site and selection of the work site supervisor should go hand in hand. If the work site is not conducive to a good learning experience, it does not matter how good the supervisor is. For example, safety factors are very important.

Gordon: We have been giving our YETP youth both orientation sessions and some simple tests to measure readiness for placement on work sites. We need to make sure we do not send enrollees out to situations where they are sure to fail. Our procedures include use of a cursory interview between the YETP enrollee and the work location supervisor -- ostensibly a "job application interview." Actually, we have matched up enrollees pretty well prior to this "interview," BUT there is a right of refusal on the part of both the work location supervisor and the YETP enrollee, so it is not just "fake."

Conway: We provide our work site location supervisors with inservice training, starting with a general orientation meeting in which we tell them about CETA, the kinds of paperwork involved, and the necessity of viewing the task as being one of training, NOT production. We also discuss grievance procedures at this orientation meeting.

Following this, we have a follow-up each quarter to get feedback from the work site supervisors in which they can tell us how we could be more helpful to them. We really regard inservice education for these supervisors as a two-way learning situation: they can learn things from us, and we certainly have much to learn from them.

Jack: In Akron, the LEA staff does all the training of the job site location supervisors.

Gary: We handle training individually in each school. We handle the work site location supervisors in the same way we handle this problem for our regular work experience program. In the summer program, the CETA staff becomes more active, including giving some group training sessions for work site location supervisors.

Dana: It would be a good idea to have a general orientation training session early in the year conducted jointly by Prime Sponsor and LEA personnel.

Conway: We have done this. Many of our work site supervisors are LEA persons, so they come, too. In a typical session, 35-50 people attend -- including PSE, LEA, and private sector persons serving as work site supervisors. We do this once each quarter; the supervisors bring in reports of their work sites (including trainee reports), and during the meetings they exchange their reports and critique each one.

Leo: At these training sessions, the work site supervisor should come in with a professional attitude -- i.e., not as a peer of the trainee, but rather as one who can provide the trainee with leadership and guidance. It really needs to be a "big brother" relationship, not a "peer relationship" or a "teacher-pupil relationship." The supervisor should be someone the trainee can look up to as a role model.

Dana: Do you not run the risk, if it is "big brother," of making the relationship too friendly so that real supervision does not occur?

Leo: NO. It is important not to lose the kid. It cannot be too much "do as I say." Instead, the relationship ought to be "I am here to help you."

Leo: Is training necessary for work site supervisors? If so, what should this training be like?

Dana: It is very necessary. In a new program, most work site supervisors would not know what is expected.

Leo: Work site supervisors need training related to CETA rules and regulations, including grievance procedures. We must have grievance procedures so that the YETP enrollee has a way of petitioning against actions taken against him. The kid needs some recourse. He cannot know about this unless we provide it. We have each enrollee sign a paper indicating he/she understands the grievance procedure. It is very important because many CETA youth have not received fair treatment in the past.

Sherm: I think this kind of training is necessary.

Bill: Seventy-five to eighty percent of our work site supervisors are coming from the private sector -- mostly from small business. We cannot get them to come to a group training session. Instead, we have to work with them one at a time at their job sites.

Gary: We want as much integrity for YETP as we have for our regular cooperative work experience. In YETP, you are probably dealing with a kid with few, if any, specific job skills. The goal of YETP is more providing enrollees with general employability skills than it is providing specific vocational skills, such as is done in our regular cooperative education program. THIS DOES NOT MEAN THERE SHOULD NOT BE QUALITY AND INTEGRITY IN THE YETP WORK EXPERIENCE.

Dana: There are six basic points to be covered in an orientation/training session for work site supervisors:

- An overview of CETA and the specific program involved
- The role of the work site supervisor
- Responsibilities of the work site supervisor
- What youth are expected to learn at the work site
- What the job site supervisor should expect of YETP enrollees
- Nature of the specific work site agreement.

Bob: We have all the six things Dana talked about -- and more -- in a handbook for work site supervisors we published. For example, in addition to Dana's six categories, we also provide supervisors with information about things such as: (a) pay days; (b) what to do in case of an accident on the job; and (c) who to call at CETA if there is an emergency.

Sherm: Most of you are in YETP settings where most of the work site supervisors are in the public domain. It is quite different with us, since most of our work sites are in the private sector; there, the supervisors must be profit-oriented. They simply do not have time to go to training sessions -- or, sometimes, even to read the manuals we prepare for them.

Bob: The problem you get into is the impossibility of doing a special handbook for each type of work experience called for under CETA. Even though we may feel separate handbooks are both needed and desirable, most work site supervisors do not see this as a primary concern. Questions such as "the role of the work site supervisor" or "what enrollees are expected to learn from this work experience" are answered, basically, in the same way -- whether it is YETP or any other kind of work experience. TO TALK ABOUT DIFFERENT "TYPES" OF WORK EXPERIENCE MIGHT BE MEANINGFUL TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND PRIME SPONSORS, BUT NOT TO WORK SITE SUPERVISORS. TO THEM, IT IS SIMPLY WORK EXPERIENCE, PERIOD.

Gordon: I like the idea of group orientation for work site supervisors, BUT we could not do it because of the amount of overhead involved. Between the time SPEDY ends and a new YETP effort begins, we have a time gap which could be used for this training if funds were made available. We do send kits to the work site supervisors, BUT most of them do not read the materials in those kits. A lot of these supervisors come from backgrounds and are the kinds of persons who, while they may be very late in turning in the kinds of reports we want, are very good in working with youth. YOU CANNOT JUDGE THEM SOLELY ON THE BASIS OF THE KINDS OF REPORTS THEY TURN IN TO US.

Sherm: DISAGREE WITH BOB (Observation #19). I DO see a difference in the YETP work experience as opposed to other kinds of work experience. It is NOT the same when the goal is (a) sharpening skills as it is when the goal is (b) exploring careers.

Dana: AGREE. The work site supervisor must realize that a lot of YETP enrollees will not have specific vocational skills.

Gordon: AGREE. It is different from, say, a kid in distributive education who has acquired both a set of middle class work values and a set of vocational skills prior to entering into work experience. The YETP enrollee may have neither.

Gary: The pitfall here is when some say "if YETP enrollees just learn to show up on time, it will have been a successful work experience." The trouble is, if that is your goal, you will never reach it. That is, unless the kid gets what, for him or her, is a MEANINGFUL work experience, he/she will not pick up the good work attitudes that we say we are looking for. That is why we want to use our basic work experience model for YETP.

Gordon: MOST work site supervisors are not paid. Some of them have been doing this for ten or more years. We ought to have some kind of recognition dinner or awards ceremony for them so they get some rewards. Maybe we could do something like this at each of the ten Regional Conferences on YETP and CAREER EDUCATION to be held this summer. One further thought: maybe you ought to have a miniconference for work site supervisors; you would learn from them.

VERY GOOD IDEAS - PAY ATTENTION.

Issue: How to plan for making maximum use of State vocational education funds, career education funds, and CETA funds to best serve all economically disadvantaged youth in a coordinated effort

Gary: My major concern is integrating CETA with both vocational education and career education -- both in terms of planning and operation. We need to look at funding in the same way -- i.e., can it be integrated? If LEA people can learn to think of CETA dollars as a source for the improvement of education, it would help. Money of any kind looks good to educators in these times.

Bob: It is certainly possible. Prime Sponsors have little knowledge of either vocational education or career education. It is not just a matter of how we use dollars. The more important thing is how we can improve useful communications among all concerned?

Bill: In Delaware, many LEAs would like CETA to give them the money, BUT then they want CETA to "stay out of the way."

Leo: We have one percent Governor's discretionary money EARMARKED FOR CAREER EDUCATION TO LINK WITH YETP. SO DOES EVERY OTHER STATE. The SEA Career Education Supervisor in Louisiana has sent letters to CETA Prime Sponsors saying he has this money and has asked the Prime Sponsors to submit proposals indicating how they want to use it. I am going to propose simply expanding some of our existing YETP programs and justify this by saying there are lots of YETP-eligible kids still not being served. We could, for example, use YETP for our "Youth Tutoring Youth" program and for our in-school career experience program. We do not need to start a brand new kind of program. There is $1.2 million dollars available under this "one percent portion."

Gary: We have about $800,000 available in the state under this "one percent career education portion." Some have suggested to us that we should try to combine our CETA State Manpower and career and vocational education planning efforts. I am not sure how it will finally be handled.

Jack: We could make plans to use this "one percent career education money" for building quality career education efforts in career awareness/exploration for economically disadvantaged youth.

Gary: Let us think of an LEA as an example. In the typical LEA, we are limited in use of vocational education funds to 11th and 12th graders already enrolled in vocational education. The trouble is, there are lots of economically disadvantaged kids who are not, for a variety of reasons, in vocational education at the present time. We could use CETA funds with economically disadvantaged 9th and 10th graders in career exploration which might help increase enrollment of economically disadvantaged youth in vocational education.

Leo: DISAGREE. Do not ask me to invent another brand new program. I have got too many complications right now. What I do not need is any more "bold new thrusts"!

Bob: AGREE, with qualifications. The problem Portland has now is a challenge to reorganize all of CETA. We sure do not have time now to go off in a brand new direction, especially considering the relatively small amount of money involved. It just would not make good sense for us in CETA to do this at this time, but it is a worthwhile venture when time allows.

Stan: Our problem, basically, is not having too much money, but rather, having too many grants of too many kinds. If there is anything we do not need now, it is one more type of categorical grant.

Sherm: Our CETA staff is overworked now. We have lots of deadlines, reports to be completed, etc. I do not need or want any more "red tape."

Bill: We really do not have to be concerned about the "one percent CETA career education money" in Delaware, now that we have our Governor's project to provide for meeting work/education needs of all 12th graders. We are in a position where we could simply add this "one percent career education money" to our already existing junior high and early senior high efforts, as readiness efforts for the Governor's program for 12th graders.

Leo: To save the CETA Prime Sponsor trouble, the SEA State Coordinator of Career Education could simply make up a plan for using this "one percent CETA career education money" and take it for approval to the State Manpower Planning Council. If it worked this way, those of us at the local community level might not have to be bothered by it.

Dana: A plan to use this "one percent CETA career education money" with 14-15 year olds would be a very good idea. We cannot wait until these youth are age 16 if we are really going to help them. An effort like this would be welcomed by most Prime Sponsors. If we had the master plan made at the State level, it could be done without much trouble at the local community level.

Leo: BUT, at the local community level, there will have to be some accounting for the money. There is no way around this; PAPER WORK WILL BE INCREASED.

Stan: We have 15 different kinds of categorical programs to work with right now, including:

- SPEDY
- YIEP
- A combination of SPEDY and YIEP
- YETP
- YCCIP
- Title II-B (basic skills)
- Title II-D (PSE)
- Title VI (PSE - counter cyclincal)
- Title VII - (private sector)
- HIRE I (for veterans)
- HIRE II (also for veterans)
- STIP I
- STIP II

- Governor's vocational education funds (the six percent money)
- Governor's four percent discretionary money
- YACC
- VEP
- YCC (Youth Conservation Corps)

With all of these categorical programs to handle simply within the existing CETA operations, it is very difficult to even think about -- let along actually accomplish -- coordination of CETA programs with those of HEW. We have a hard time just trying to coordinate our own CETA programs.

Conway: What we need is to consolidate all youth programs into one master plan for each CETA Prime Sponsor, WITH ONE CONSOLIDATED SET OF RULES AND REGULATIONS. This would greatly lessen the paper work and, as a result, free our staff to do more interaction with our sites. At the present time, many CETA Prime Sponsors are leery of putting too much effort into their youth programs because some of them -- like YETP and YIEP -- are funded only until 1981.

Leo: For the first time, we had to submit a MASTER PLAN FOR CETA this year. In prior years, we had to submit a package for each CETA title at different times during the year. Thus, the Department of Labor is moving toward a consolidated approach to CETA. Under this new system, we make a five year plan, plus annual plans. Under this arrangement, YOUTH PROGRAMS are included in this master plan -- BUT not as a consolidated portion simply called YOUTH PROGRAMS, as they should be.

Conway: Last February, our Regional Department of Labor office sponsored a youth conference. There, we were told we had to coordinate our youth programs with efforts of a variety of special interest groups, such as groups representing the handicapped and women. This simply makes the job even more difficult.

Stan: The LEAs have a tough time now relating with CETA Prime Sponsors. If we had a coordinated youth plan, it would really help. Now the LEAs are talking to us about such things as the "10 percent YETP experimental program for youth from all socio-economic backgrounds." For LEAs, it is a way of serving all kids, BUT for those of us in CETA, it just means "one more category" on top of all the rest.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 121

Both Transition Services and Career Employment Experiences

March 27 and 28, 1978

Participants

Ms. Rita C. Fantin
Program Coordinator
Montgomery County Public Schools
Rockville, Maryland

Mr. Walter Wolfe
Program Assistant - YETP
Montgomery County Division
of Labor Services
Silver Spring, Maryland

Mr. Joseph Nicholas Delgardo
Coordinator of Youth Employment
Boston Public Schools
Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. Albert R. McMahill
Manager of the Educational
Services Unit
Youth Services Department
Employment and Economic
Policy Administration
Boston, Massachusetts

Dr. Joseph T. Coleman, Jr.
Supervisor of Youth Programs
Roanoke, Virginia

Mr. Donald K. King, Planner
Roanoke Consortium for
Manpower Services
Roanoke, Virginia

Mr. Richard Gabriel
Career and Vocational Education
Des Moines Independent
School District
Des Moines, Iowa

Ms. Bette Fulton
CETA Planner
Central Iowa Regional Association
of Local Government
Des Moines, Iowa

Dr. Raymond Lee Billingsley, Director
High School Improvement Project
Newton County Comprehensive High School
Covington, Georgia

Observers

Mr. Gene Berube
Education Program Officer
Bureau of Occupational
and Adult Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Don Eisinger
Manpower Training Supervisor
Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Jefferson City, Missouri

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. What kinds of community linkages are being built in YETP that will make it a continuing effort after the Federal funds are gone?

2. How can we get quality services to YETP youth?

3. How do we best help YETP youth make transitions from school to work in ways that will improve their self image?

4. How do we best tie career education and work experience into the YETP effort?

5. How to untangle the YETP red tape so that YETP can reach youth better and more quickly.

6. How to help school and CETA bureaucracies better understand each other.

7. How to make a YETP agreement work well when the school system is understaffed.

8. How to make sure that bona fide jobs are available for YETP youth.

9. How to use YETP as a way of encouraging youth to stay in school.

10. How to help local community people deal with their natural distrust of the Federal Government.

11. What are the essential start-up problems to be solved in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements?

12. How to better involve the private sector in YETP.

13. How to utilize YETP funds to subsidize youth employment in the private sector.

14. How to solve the allowance vs. wage problems of YETP.

15. How to work LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements with an intermediate unit rather than with individual school districts.

16. How can CETA best provide technical assistance to school districts, and vice versa?

17. How can we get over the "turf" problem in making YETP work?

18. How to get rid of the necessity for using a dual mechanism for solving a single problem.

19. How to integrate YETP into a total career development program for youth.

20. How can we improve communication between top administrators in both education and CETA at the community/State/Federal levels?

21. How can we do pre-service teacher education that will make educators more aware of and sympathetic to CETA efforts?

22. How to get practical Department of Labor guidelines and technical assistance for use in monitoring and evaluating YETP efforts.

23. How to find time for adequate planning in YETP efforts.

24. What kind of information is needed, and how can it be collected, for reporting to Congress on YETP?

25. What would be an ideal long-term evaluation design for YETP?

26. How can more segments of the youth population be included in YETP eligibility requirements (e.g., handicapped, juvenile offenders, etc.)?

27. How to be able to change students programs so they can participate in YETP as part of their educational program.

28. How to get YETP funding for a multi-year period rather than 12 months at a time.

29. How to help students see relationships between YETP and the rest of their educational program.

30. How to solve the transportation problem for YETP youth.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP EFFORTS

Al McMahill and Joe Delgardo - Boston, Massachusetts

Al (Prime Sponsor representative)

The CETA office in Boston administers about $65 million per year and is called the EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMIC POLICY ADMINISTRATION (EEPA). Its Director reports to the Mayor of Boston. In EEPA, we have a number of Departments including three dealing with people: (a) PSE, (b) Employment and Training, and (c) Youth. I am in the "Youth Department."

In our "Youth Division," all except our YIEP project programs are subcontracted to CBOs -- for example, SPEDY: to one subcontractor; YETP: both a 22 percent contract to the Boston schools and the remaining 78 percent subcontracted to various CBOs. Our Youth Division also includes a $14 million YIEP Entitlement project which EEPA operates directly. We also have two YOUTH WORK grants, which are linked to YIEP.

In designing our YETP program, we took YIEP as a given and developed our YETP program around it. For example, in schools with YIEP, YETP is limited to 14 and 15 year olds (with the 16 to 19 year old youth in YIEP); whereas, in other schools, 16 to 19 year old youth are in our YETP program.

YIEP told out-of-school youth that they would have to agree to return to high school if they want to participate. It was senseless to consider putting them back in the same schools that had forced them to drop out earlier. As a result, we created a system of alternative schools for these YIEP youth. We have now reached the point where academic credit can be awarded in these alternative schools.

Joe (LEA representative)

Planning for YETP started by considering those schools in our system which were not participating in the YIEP effort. We started out by issueing RFPs to schools in the system; each RFP called for a non-financial agreement. For example, we have one dealing with only special needs students while others address other parts of the YETP problem.

Career education is very important in the whole plan. After all, these youth are involved in career education for some time before they enter the YETP program. One of the relationships we are proud of is that City Hall people are now speaking to school people, and school people are now speaking with CBOs.

We have now initiated a number of new middle school programs for 14 and 15 year olds; these are based on WECEP. We are collecting some evidence with respect to the effectiveness of these efforts. For example, at the Edison School we have found school attendance rates rose, after YETP was introduced, from 40 percent to 90 percent. These efforts are being given academic credit by the Boston school system.

All in-school YETP programs are run by teachers -- with help from counselors, career education persons, parents, and others. Our YETP youth are helped after school both by "job developers" and by "job supervisors." These YETP programs, by and large, operate in the afternoon, with YETP youth enrolled in regular school courses in the morning.

Questions and Answers

Q - How much academic credit are you giving middle school kids for YETP?
A - 15 points. In our system, 10 points counts as "one course."

Q - Who initiated the YETP grants in Boston?
A - We started by considering we had 22 percent of the YETP funds to use -- about $352,000. We then went to each school and made sure each school building knew about the availability of this program.

Q - Who reviewed and evaluated the RFPs you produced and proposals recieved?
A - A variety of persons, including representatives from the teachers' union, students, etc.

Q - Are your YETP teachers paid for under the 22 percent funds for YETP?
A - Each school has to have someone, paid for by school district funds, running its YETP program. In some schools, teachers in YETP are being paid with YETP funds, while in other schools they are not.

Q - What does your "22 percent money" go for?
A - Primarily for youth wages in "career employment experiences." Only seven percent is used for administrative costs.

Q - How much total YETP and YCCIP money do you have in Boston?
A - About $2 million. Remember, 78 percent of YETP and all of YCCIP go to CBOs, not the school system.

Q - Who operates your in-school Title II-B CETA program?
A - Our Employment and Training Division of the Prime Sponsor's office.

Q - Do you see YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements in Boston ever going higher than the "22 percent minimum"?
A - No. BUT if we ever went above the "22 percent minimum," we would hear about it.

Q - How are your "78 percent YETP funds" managed by CBOs being used?
A - They are used mostly for in-school youth. There is not usually a "turf" or "overlap" problem. The local school IS aware of all these programs and can see that coordination, not overalap, occurs.

Q - Have you compared your "22 percent successes" with your "78 percent successes"?
A - We do not yet have that data.

Q - Are you using private sector sites for YETP work experience?
A - NO, we are using public and private non-profit sites and PSE settings.

Joe Coleman and Don King - Roanoke, Virginia

Don (Prime Sponsor representative)

We serve a four-county area with a Policy Board having representatives from each. The City of Roanoke serves as our CETA fiscal agent. We have about $500,000 for YETP. In our first year of operation, 44 percent of our YETP funds went to LEAs. This year, about 50 percent of our YETP funds are going to LEAs. We have entered into both financial and non-financial agreements for YETP with LEAs, and have academic credit for both the work experience and OJT portions of YETP. Our OJT efforts are primarily in the private sector.

Both of our LEAs are including what, in YETP, are called "career employment experiences" and "transition services," BUT since all of our YETP youth are in "career employment experiences" -- and these include "transition services" -- we technically refer to ours as a "career employment experience" effort. If some of our YETP youth were not involved in work experience, we could say we have both "transition services" and "career employment experiences."

We have two CBOs running the out-of-school portion of YETP, and tie YETP into other youth programs such as YCCIP, SPEDY, and Title VI. A youth leaving any one of these programs is told where he/she might go for additional services.

We have a problem in OJT in certifying youth as "eligible" and in figuring out what is going to happen to them after they leave YETP. In order to help in job placement, the Prime Sponsor is now taking over the entire job development, job placement, and outreach functions along with responsibility for certifying youth as YETP "eligible."

Joe (LEA representative)

We operate in every junior and senior high school in Roanoke. We have a full-time YETP paid coordinator in each senior high, plus one additional YETP paid "coordinator" for every two junior high schools in our system. This gives us a total of five coordinators.

We currently serve about 20 OJT youth and about 80 work experience youth. It is tough because the private sector is leery of taking Federal money and, as a result, is suspicious of CETA. We have no real problems with work experience. Kids seem to be getting better, more realistic work experience when we place them in private sector slots. We do not have final evaluation data yet for FY 79, but we have positive non-inferential data that indicate our YETP youth are being helped.

Questions and Answers

Q - Why have you had such a long turn-around time between "intake" and "certification as eligible"?
A - It did not work out well with our previous subcontractor. We expect this to improve markedly now that the Prime Sponsor is taking over this responsibility.

Q - What do you see as "YETP eligibility" problems?
A - We have many in-school youth who could profit from YETP but who are not financially "eligible"; they are not quite poor enough.

Q - Are you using the "private for profit" sector as well as "private non-profit"?
A - Only seniors are being placed in OJT and, of course, they must be in the "private for profit" sector.

Q - What does it mean to say your Prime Sponsor will now do "eligibility certification"?
A - We decided to concentrate our YETP efforts on dropout-prone in-school youth. We ask the school system to identify the "dropout-prone" youth. The Prime Sponsor staff then goes into the school to actually certify them as "YETP-eligible." Our "in-school YETP coordinator" in each school takes YETP applicants through the intake process, BUT the Prime Sponsor assumes responsibility for actually certifying them as "YETP-eligible."

Q - What percent of your YETP funds go to pay for salaries of your "in-school YETP coordinators?"
A - About 40 percent. The "coordinator," in addition to teaching a career exploration course for YETP youth, also arranges for work sites and makes visits to YETP youth on their jobs.

Q - How many youth are you serving in your YETP in-school program?
A - 120.

Q - How many hours per week do your YETP youth work?
A - 10 to 15 hours.

Q - What is the workload for your "YETP In-school Coordinators"?
A - We have one "Coordinator" for every 20 YETP enrollees.

Ray Billingsley - Covington, Georgia

Ray (LEA representative)

In Georgia, generally speaking, YETP money is going to CBOs, NOT to school districts in the form of "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements." The CBOs, in turn, are serving in-school youth.

In my own program, I am operating under a grant from YOUTH WORK to develop a community based program for YETP-eligible youth. We are committed, in this program, to finding ways of providing academic credit to participants. Serving 100 students, this program operates primarily through private sector involvement using the VEPS guidelines that allow us to pay participants "allowances" rather than "wages."

Our program operates under a basic plan that calls for participants to spend three hours in school and three in work experience each day. The majority of our work sites are now in the private sector.

We operate this program with four "LEARNING COORDINATORS" -- one for every 25 students. Students begin by exploring a number of work sites in terms of career interests and aptitudes. They then pick one site for the purpose of spending sufficient time there to pick up a specific job skill.

To receive academic credit for the three hours per day spent at the work site, the youth, with the help of his/her LEARNING COORDINATOR, arranges for various kinds of experiential learning directly related to both the work and a particular academic course for which academic credit is desired. To make this work, we have developed a RESOURCE GUIDE keyed back to both "career clusters" and to "specific curriculum areas." Thus, specific experiences are arranged that will allow the youth to earn, for example, one academic credit in "English" for a particular form of experiential learning. The LEARNING COORDINATOR is the key to making the kinds of arrangements necessary to make this work.

A youth can spend up to 20 hours per week at the job site in this project.

Only 13 percent of our youth are able to provide their own transportation to the work site. Thus, we have to make arrangements for transporting the others.

Our "work experience" differs from traditional work-study in that our participants are viewed primarily as "learners," not as "earners."

We do a great deal of pre-assessment of our youth participants.

The Northwest Regional Laboratory serves as our third party evaluator.

Questions and Answers

Q - Why is transportation a problem for you?
A - Our work sites are typically three miles or more from the school. Thus, we operate two buses and one van that typically run all day long.

Q - Is this YOUTH WORK project essentially an EBCE program?
A - It is an adaptation of EBCE. We have modified EBCE to simplify the paper work and to relate the experiential learning more closely with our school curriculum.

Q - Who is your Prime Sponsor?
A - Balance of State. We have good communication between us.

Q - How can you operate in Georgia without any "22 percent LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements"?
A - Under YETP, it is possible for non-financial agreements to exist under which the LEAs give up all rights to use of any of the YETP funds.

Q - Do you have evaluation data yet?
A - We have some. We have some data showing improvement in acquiring the basic employability skills.

Q - Did your school board object to granting academic credit for your participants?
A - No.

Q - How much is your YOUTH WORK grant?
A - $406,000.

Q - What kinds of subjects do your participants take in their three hours of classwork in the school?
A - It depends on what they need for graduation. They are all either juniors or seniors. Our first quarter students all take a "career education course" aimed at providing them with general employability skills.

Bette Fulton and Dick Gabriel - Des Moines, Iowa

Dick (LEA representative)

Iowa is unique in that, in the early 1960s, we developed a network of 16 community colleges which now get most of Iowa's vocational education funds.

There are seven CETA Prime Sponsors in Iowa.

We had YETP-like activities going on as early as 1968, partly through our work with the local Chamber of Commerce. We called this early effort "NEW HORIZONS." When Department of Labor people came out and looked at it, they converted it into a national effort that they called WECEP.

Before CETA, we had trouble getting money out of our State Manpower Council for youth programs. The council was mostly concerned about adult-oriented activities.

Des Moines has had a strong career education effort since about 1970.

Bette (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our YETP effort serves 56 school districts in eight counties.

Prior to YEDPA, we had CETA in-school programs (under the old Title I) operating through a subcontract with a CBO. This CBO had developed very good informal relationships with the LEAs. It was important to us to continue to serve all these LEAs under YEDPA. In order to do this, we found it practical to make a single LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement with the Area Education Agency (AEA) which, as an intermediate unit of our State Department of Public Instruction, served this eight-county area.

We considered whether to make our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement a "financial" or "non-financial" agreement. Because we had a very good CBO which had already established good working relationships with the LEAs, we decided to make a "non-financial" agreement with the AEA and operate YETP under a contract with our CBO. The AEA was interested in working with us primarily because it wanted to know what was going on in career education in each of the 56 LEAs. As a result, the AEA hired, with its money, a full-time person to deal with this task.

We surveyed every LEA in the eight-county area to find out (a) what they are now doing; (b) who they now serve; and (c) what they would like to do if they had some funds for use in improving their efforts. On the basis of the data that resulted from this survey, we made up RFPs that were sent to the 56 LEAs. Of the 16 LEAs which responded to this RFP, we were able to fund 12. The other four did not submit a response that we could fund. We are now in the process of reviewing each of the contracts resulting from these RFPs.

This year, we again have a non-financial agreement with the AEA. As the AEA becomes more knowledgeable regarding CETA, it is possible that we may, at some time in the future, switch to a financial agreement.

Forty-eight percent of our YETP money goes for in-school related activities. Of this, most is for youth wages; some is for a limited number of CBO staff persons who work with the LEAs, but NOTHING goes to any LEA directly. We are thinking it might be better if we give some funds to the LEAs; they are very busy and could use some additional staff help.

We serve 270 youth, each of whom is involved in 10 hours per week of work experience during the school year in our YETP in-school program. Most of our YETP youth are "SPEDY-eligible" and go into our SPEDY program in the summer. We have many more "YETP-eligible youth" than we have funds to serve.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do your LEAs include parochial schools as well as public schools?
A - Yes. We have one parochial school in the eight-county area and it is included.

Q - (to Dick Gabriel) How do you like subcontracting with the CBO instead of dealing directly with the CETA Prime Sponsor?
A - It does not bother us in the Des Moines school system. We have had a good relationship with CETA for several years and get along fine.

Q - What does the Area Education Agency (AEA) get out of this non-financial agreement?
A - It gives the AEA a way of learning what is happening in the 56 LEAs with respect to career education. The AEA sees that it may be possible for it to get a financial agreement from the CETA Prime Sponsor at some time in the future.

Q - Is "career education" well defined in Iowa?
A - It varies.

Q - What is your perception of what is happening to the "family farm concept" in Iowa?
A - It is going away.

Q - Do you have anything to do with YOUTH WORK in the Des Moines public schools?
A - Yes. We have 120 students in an EBCE-like YOUTH WORK project in the private sector. We also have an apprentice program funded for us by BAT.

Rita Fantin and Walter Wolfe - Montgomery County, Maryland

Walter (Prime Sponsor representative)

We had $270,587 for use in YETP during FY 1978. The over-riding factor that caused us to award 90 percent of our YETP funds to the LEA was that, with the relatively small amount of money available, we could not develop a high quality program susceptible to careful evaluation if we spread our funds around in a number of different kinds of efforts.

Montgomery County, Maryland is an affluent area of about 600,000 persons. Seventy-two to seventy-six percent of high school graduates go on to college, but only 28 percent finish a degree. People in Montgomery County tend to ignore the increasing importance of and need for career education and vocational education.

We did the grant preparation in late 1977 and early 1978. The resulting RFP was advertised throughout our county -- including giving it to some CBOs. When responses came in, it was obvious that the Montgomery County Schools had the best approach. In Montgomery County, our CBOs tend not to be politically powerful or aggressive. It is too bad. We are now trying to interest CBOs by involving them as members of our Youth Council.

We signed our YETP contract with the Montgomery County Schools in March, 1978, and it became operational in June. Since July, we have been monitoring this YETP effort carefully.

We decided to limit this YETP program to 125 youth who were: (a) economically disadvantaged, and (b) minority.

Rita (LEA representative)

Our school system has, as a regular part of its operations, a number of kinds of work experience programs.

Our YETP program, when we started in FY 78, was aimed at in-school 16-17 year olds. Students in our YETP program go to school for a full school day (beginning at 7:30 A.M. and lasting until 3:00 P.M.). After 3:00 P.M., they come to us for a two-hour period each day. In addition to the two hours after school spent with us, each YETP enrollee takes a "Career Awareness Course" for which one half unit of academic credit is given. This same course is offered to other students in a limited number of schools in the county for credit. In the area schools we selected, it had not been offered or was not available for our YETP enrollees. Thus, getting academic credit for this course was no problem.

To get academic credit for the OJT portion of our YETP program, we had to make sure that we had qualified teachers for (a) office occupations; (b) small machine repair; and (c) home maintenance. Students enrolled in these training courses in our YETP program receive one half unit academic credit plus $2.65 per hour "allowance" -- now $2.90 per hour (minimum wage).

Our in-school YETP effort can be thought of as being in three phases:

Phase I - The "Career Awareness Course" for seven weeks (one half credit).

Phase II - Pre-vocational exploration and assessment based on a people/data/things organization that cuts across wide occupational areas and provides students with a variety of hands-on job sampling for seven weeks (one half credit).

Phase III - A skill training course or an OJT position for 14 weeks (one half credit).

Our YETP youth like the idea of going to work, but do not much like the idea of coming out of a full day of school and then being asked to spend two more hours (from 3:00 to 5:00 P.M.) in school again taking our YETP training courses. We try to tell them that the "school" we provide is really a "job" but this does not get through to all of them. As a result, our drop-out rate is fairly high.

IDEALLY, we would like to see Phases I,II, and the training part of Phase III go on during the regular school day. That way, students in the summer can be placed in OJT positions for which they have been trained and have acquired certain skills.

Questions and Answers

Q - What if you ran your program in a "store front" type setting -- rather than having it take place in a regular school building -- but operated it during after-school hours?
A - It would cost more to do it that way. We now pay all four professional staff members (Rita as Director plus three "Advocates") along with two supporting staff persons full salaries from our YETP funds. In addition, we pay eight teachers part-time with YETP funds to teach our after-school program. Montgomery County school funds are not used to pay for any of these positions.

Q - How much are your YETP enrollees working in the summer?
A - We will try to link them with SPEDY. If not successful, we hope to convince employers to keep them at no cost to YETP.

Q - What do your "Advocates" do?
A - They are actually counselors but, since they are not certificated as such, we can not call them by that title. They recruit and counsel students, check on absences, work with parents, and work closely with regular school counselors. Most importantly they help the students plan and carry out individual learning programs based on personal needs, interests, and assessments for future job placement. Each of these "Advocates" is a certificated teacher.

Q - Has the term "Advocate" created problems at your YETP work sites?
A - No. Nor has it created any problems within our schools. Each "Advocate" has about 25 students now. (Each started out with 42.) Since many YETP enrollees have dropped out, the advocates' work load is lighter.

Q - Why are youth dropping out of your YETP program?
A - For a variety of reasons including: (a) the school day is too long with classes from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. (b) their desire to participate in extra-curricular activities; (c) personal problems; (d) they moved out of area; (e) financial need for more work hours; (f) lack of transportation.

THREE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to get rid of the necessity for using a dual mechanism for solving a single problem.
- What are the essential "start-up" problems to be solved in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements?
- What would be an ideal long-term evaluation design for YETP?

Issue: How to get rid of the necessity for using a dual mechanism for solving a single problem

Bette: The Department of Labor has a set of mandated requirements for us to use in making LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements including: (a) eligibility; (b) payment mechanism; (c) client characteristics; (d) processes we must follow. Educators have other criteria on which they make programmatic decisions. The need is to break the language barrier and come down with a common language that will lead to a common set of understandings. For example, when I say "Title I," I mean "Title I of CETA" but educators typically think of "Title I of ESEA."

Al: AGREE. "Education" and "training" mean different things to Department of Labor persons, but it does not make sense to most educators to try to distinguish between them.

Walt: AGREE. A common language is essential for meaningful evaluation. For example, "career decision-making," "counseling," and "career exploration" all mean different things to Department of Labor persons as opposed to educators. There is a problem.

Walt: It is more complex than just a language problem. Behind this are real basic philosophical differences in the ways the Department of Labor and educators approach youth problems.

Dick: We need to recognize that not all "education" takes place in school buildings. We need to have teachers understand that kids can deserve academic credit for things done in places other than a "classroom in a school building."

Bette: A significant communication problem occurred with issuance of the new CETA legislation last October. Perhaps there is a way of solving this if we do what should be done in meeting our requirements to rewrite the YEDPA provisions (which must be done by October 1 of this year).

Joe C.: If the CETA regulations cannot be simplified, many LEAs are going to start backing off from even trying to work with CETA.

Dick: Communication relates to evaluation. One of the reasons vocational education is being criticized is its lack of a good, uniform accounting system for use in reporting to Congress. This same problem can be expected for YETP unless it is faced and solved.

Joe C.: AGREE. But data on things like the numbers of blacks-whites, males-females, etc. are not important. We should be able to report to Congress based on our objectives. We need to emphasize EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES more than YETP currently does. I do not know whether or not the Department of Labor knows enough to put its rules and regulations in this form. As I see it, the problem is not with the Prime Sponsors -- i.e., they are understanding the education system -- the real problem seems to be with the Department of Labor.

Bette: Remember, the Department of Labor has to pay attention to what Congress requires it to do. Perhaps the basic problem worrying educators about Department of Labor reporting procedures is that Department of Labor persons are more "statistics-oriented" than are educators.

Al: The problem can be easily seen by simply observing how badly the Youth Work projects are missing the boat on the concept of "knowledge development."

Bette: Sometimes, it seems that "reporting" is more important than "serving people." If YEDPA is re-written in terms of its evaluation components, we should ask, first of all, "Why do we need this information? Will it be useful in solving the school-to-work transition problem for youth?" The Department of Labor does not know much about either the evaluation criteria or the philosophy used by the Office of Education, and vice versa.

Al: AGREE. We need the Department of Labor and the Office of Education to work together more closely at the Federal level. What if the "22 percent minimum" idea were extended to include agreements between the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare? Then, perhaps, a closer working relationship would exist, just as happened with the "22 percent minimum" requirement at the local community level.

Al: The definitional problem is not so big if we have only one Prime Sponsor dealing with only one school district, BUT it is really big if multiple school districts are involved. This is because educators do not agree among themselves on definitions of the kinds of terms we have been talking about here. THAT IS THE PROBLEM.

Walt: There are two different "worlds" -- education and CETA. In the "CETA world," all laws present handicaps in terms of my ability to deal effectively with school systems.

Rita: AGREE. For example, Walt came to see me last week and asked for some information on students which is part of our school system's confidential files. Because he could not go in those files, I did it and then reported the information on him using "numbers," not "names" to represent students.

Al: We are now being asked to incorporate, in effect, a "YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement" and a "Title II-B LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement" into a master plan. This is going to make for further communications/language barrier problems in that, while we are dealing with career education in YETP, we find ourselves dealing with vocational education in the Title II-B portion of the new CETA legislation.

Al: At the operating community level, both Department of Labor and LEA persons involved in making an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement work have to trust each other. To do so, they have to each be trusted by their respective "bosses." This, in turn, must extend from the Prime Sponsor level to the Regional Offices of the Department of Labor, although I must admit the Regional Offices of the Department of Labor appear to be losing the great influence they used to have on local Prime Sponsors -- with the Department of Labor on the Federal level taking over a significant portion of that influence.

Bette: AGREE. The Department of Labor Regional Office is more and more becoming simply a "flow-through of funds."

Joe D.: AGREE. Both Al and I have a commitment to deliver needed services to youth. This is our common bond. As a school employee, I am paid out of YETP funds. Al and I can now look at the Department of Labor rules and regulations and agree among ourselves on their operational meaning to us. We both can, and do, also relate very closely to the career education program in our school district (which is headquartered very near my office).

Issue: What are the essential "start-up" problems to be solved in LEA/Prime Sponsor Agreements?

Ray: Yesterday, I made a mistake in saying we have no LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements in Georgia. We *do* have some, but they are all non-financial agreements (in which, for example, the school agrees to supervise the work experience but money for youth wages flows through a CBO).

"Start-up Problem #1 - In terms of "start-up" problems, the basic problem we had was in trying to figure out what the Prime Sponsor had in mind. Further, we had trouble discovering whom to contact in the Prime Sponsor's office, *i.e.*, who had the authority to tell us we could or could not do what we wanted to do?

I feel strongly that there should be some kind of training given to LEAs to help them learn how to solve these kinds of problems.

Al: Theoretically, in the way in which YOUTH WORK interacts with the Department of Labor in the District of Columbia, the local Prime Sponsor plays a critically important role; *actually*, the Prime Sponsor appears to operate as a simple conduit for funds. As a Prime Sponsor representative, I have not really been helping with YOUTH WORK projects in our area.

Joe C.: DISAGREE. The YOUTH WORK representative is supposed to deal with the LEA, not with the Prime Sponsor.

Bette: There *is* a trend for YOUTH WORK staff to work directly with the LEA, thus bypassing the local Prime Sponsor.

Ray: In our community, the YOUTH WORK representative at first went through the Prime Sponsor to get to us, but not now. There is some hostility on the part of Prime Sponsors toward YOUTH WORK.

Dick: One interesting example to note is that, in Des Moines, those of us in the local school system got copies of the YOUTH WORK invitation to submit proposals before our local Prime Sponsor had received that announcement.

Bette: There is some feeling on the part of some Prime Sponsor staffs that they are a kind of "excess baggage" in the YOUTH WORK operations.

Rita: "Start-up" Problem #2 - the lateness with which we receive RFPs related to the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. Coupled with this is a related problem: the necessity for the proposal we wrote to go through both our Board of Education and the Prime Sponsor for approval.

Bette: The proposal could have been submitted to both the Board of Education and the Prime Sponsor at the same time.

Walt: Bette is right. BUT each level of bureaucracy acts inevitably to slow down the whole approval process, so it is still a legitimate "start-up" problem.

Al: "Start-up" Problem #3 - Another problem is that all LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements have to go through community review.

Bette: NO. They do have to go through the Youth Council but not the general community for review.

Walt: AGREE WITH BETTE. The RFP for the YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement goes through the Youth Council, but not out for general community review.

Al: The "Master Plan" of each Prime Sponsor (including plans for the "22 percent" portion) has to go out for community review. This is a document in which the Prime Sponsor indicates a plan for spending all CETA money.

Bette: AGREE. But that "Master Plan" is very broad. It does not talk specifically about either the "22 percent agreement" or anything else. This is a "start-up" problem only in that the Prime Sponsor does have to have a Master Plan that has been through community review and approval by the Regional Office of the Department of Labor.

"Start-up" Problem #4 - the time frames required for us. The Department of Labor does not give the Prime Sponsor enough time to research, plan, and come up with a really good idea. Too often, that means we are acting in a "crisis" fashion -- and that makes problems for the LEA as well.

Joe C.: AGREE. For example, an LEA might be informed that a proposal is due within a two-week period. If you do not write it using Department of Labor terminology, you are in trouble; you have to get some technical assistance from the Prime Sponsor. Further, many LEAs do not even know whom to go see in the Prime Sponsor's office when they need help.

Even worse, there are still many LEAs which do not even know what a "Prime Sponsor" is -- or whether or not they have one!

Dick: "Start-up" Problem #5 - There is no real communication -- so no good agreement or standard procedures -- among Prime Sponsors. We have seven Prime Sponsors in Iowa which are examples of this. Many LEAs do not even know what Prime Sponsor area they are in. Further, Prime Sponsors come out with different "rules." For example, our "Balance of State" Prime Sponsor regards the "22 percent" as a maximum while our own local Prime Sponsor regards it as a minimum.

Al: "Start-up" Problem #6 - Some Prime Sponsors do not even have a Youth Services Department, so LEAs have no idea whom to contact in the Prime Sponsor's office.

Don K.: We have seven LEAs in our area, five of whom are represented on one or more of our CETA Councils. Further, we have agreements with all seven of these LEAs. I get out to see all seven at least once a month. If the LEA does not come to us, we, as the Prime Sponsor, go to them.

Dick: We tried, in terms of interesting LEAs in CETA, to start with a survey sent to all 58 of our LEAs. We then worked with those LEAs who responded to the survey. Should the Prime Sponsor be expected to go further in attempts to interest LEAs in the YETP effort?

Bette: "Start-up" Problem #7a - LEAs need some constant information coming to them "from the top" of Education telling them what their role is in CETA in general and in YETP in particular. Without this kind of internal communication among educators, the LEAs do not know how to respond to contact their Prime Sponsors. Such information is badly needed.

Dick: "Start-up" problem #7b - In the SEA, the CETA person often is not tied closely to the SEA State Coordinator of Career Education.

Don K. We are zeroing in here on "career education and YETP," BUT there are also many other activities in both Education and in the Department of Labor that ought to result in LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships. We really need to think about "LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships" in a BROAD SENSE. It is too narrow to try to think just about YETP. It is obvious why, in terms of the "22 percent money," LEAs are interested in YETP. But, as a Prime Sponsor, we need to involve LEAs in ALL of our CETA programs, even in Title VII.

Bette: DISAGREE WITH DON. In our area, it is the opposite. Programmatically, with the exception of YETP, we plan everything we do with the community colleges, not with LEAs. It is only in YETP that we deal with LEAs.

Walt: We come in between Don and Bette. While some of our CETA programs (STIP for example) call for relationships with community colleges, we have many other parts of CETA that called for close LEA/Prime Sponsor working relationships that existed long before YETP came into existence.

Don E.: In Missouri, all our vocational education training is at the secondary school level rather than at the post-secondary level (through our vocational-technical schools). Our most successful youth programs are those that started with MDTA in the 1963-64 period. Where we have problems is with the smaller Prime Sponsors (which came into existence about 1974-75 and have not yet developed any good working relationships with LEAs). Just simple preservation needs enter in here. The vocational-technical directors are good "grant hustlers," and it has been natural that we should use them in establishing LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships and agreements.

Gene: The basic philosophy of "commitment to serving the disadvantaged" is the same for all CETA programs; what the disadvantaged need is also the same.

Bette: DISAGREE. The philosophy of "working with the disadvantaged" is the same, BUT the needs of those to be served differ. If we can say that adults need remedial job skills, we must say youth need a preventive/developmental effort.

Dick: Adults need a "preventive/developmental" effort in addition to their need for "remedial job skills."

Don K. It is a real error to think that any single agency can be "the" answer to meeting the needs of all persons. That is why we, as a Prime Sponsor, use the LEAs (including their several parts), the private sector, apprenticeship, etc. CETA must be a total community effort.

Al: Here are two new "Start-up" Problems: #8 - timing related to school year/Department of Labor FY interface; and #9 - Department of Labor allocation of funds to Prime Sponsors. As an example, here is what we are faced with in Boston:

Year	Allocation	Period	Dates
FY78	"X"	9 months	January-September
FY79			
(expected)	133% "X"	12 months	Oct. 1-Sept. 30
(actual)	27% "lag" plus 93% "X"	12 months	Oct. 1-Sept. 30

Thus, in Boston: 8 percent actual lag; 93 percent + 8 percent = 101 percent.

Explanation: In FY 78, we all received "X" dollars to be spent in 9 months. We were told: "youth programs are popular; expect your funds to be increased by 33 percent in FY 79." Actually, somebody decided that, since the Prime Sponsor had, on the average, a 27 percent lag between what it received and what it could spend in FY 78, it would need only an actual 8 percent increase over the FY 78 level of funding in order to have a net effective increase of 35 percent for FY 79.

For good, active efforts such as ours -- where, instead of having 27 percent left, we had only 8 percent left of FY 78 funds -- we were, in effect, penalized for having done too much during FY 78.

Now, we find ourselves with 101 percent of what we had for use in FY 78 during 9 months and are asked to stretch it out in FY 79 over 12 months.

Joe C.: Last year, we were under-spent, but this year more LEAs have expressed interest. There is not enough money now to go around.

THE NET EFFECT IS THAT IT MAKES SOME VERY PRACTICAL "START-UP" PROBLEMS WHEN A PRIME SPONSOR DOES NOT KNOW WHAT ITS TOTAL ALLOCATION IS GOING TO BE FOR THE COMING FISCAL YEAR.

Issue: What would be an ideal long-term evaluation design for YETP?

Walt: I had no contact with the Department of Labor Regional office until January of this year. Obviously, the Federal YETP regulations make it clear that there should be an emphasis on monitoring and evaluating, but they did not say what should be done. I had to learn about four different types of monitoring. For evaluation, I decided to use the ten criteria in the YEDPA Knowledge Development Plan. Both "monitoring" and "evaluation" are hard tasks for both the Prime Sponsor and for the LEA. We need education about how to do monitoring and evaluation.

The new regulations are more specific but still not sufficient to meet our needs in these very important areas.

Al: We know that LEAs and Prime Sponsors are supposed to work collaboratively in carrying out the YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement, BUT when we come to the monitoring/evaluation function, it is very hard to avoid a "we/they" kind of relationship.

Walt: Monitoring and evaluation should be separate from planning and program operation.

Joe C.: DISAGREE. Our CETA monitor did not know enough about what we were doing to know what criteria were appropriate for use in evaluating our efforts.

Dick: AGREE WITH WALT. The people who do the "planning" should not be the same ones who do the "evaluation"; you should not "evaluate" yourself!

Walt: Under the new regulations, "monitoring and evaluation" are separated to assure objectivity, BUT you are supposed to establish linkages with planning so that the program can be evaluated.

Don K: There is a difference between "monitoring" and "evaluation." The "monitor" is charged with seeing if the contractor is doing what the contract calls for him/her to do. "Evaluation," on the other hand, centers around outcomes and products -- i.e., with how well the contract is accomplishing its objectives (as opposed to simply following the required procedures, which is "monitoring"). To meet Department of Labor requirements, "monitoring" is crucial.

Bette: In the new regulations, "monitoring units" are a required part of the Prime Sponsor's office, BUT the monitoring units are also supposed to do "evaluation."

Al: "Monitoring" is done jointly for YETP by the LEA and the Prime Sponsor in Boston. "Evaluation" is handled differently. For five years now, the State of Massachusetts has set aside $6 million annually to aid in desegregation. By law, four percent of that money has to be set aside for evaluation. There is no lack of firms available to do evaluation -- i.e., with 30 colleges and universities in the Boston area, they all think they are qualified. We designed an RFP for our YETP evaluation, sent it out to 20-30 firms, looked at the responses jointly (i.e., LEA and Prime Sponsor personnel together) and made a mutual decision with respect to which firm is to evaluate the YETP effort. The firm was told it has to evaluate BOTH the LEA and the Prime Sponsor.

Joe D.: Part of our evaluation system will be to tie evaluation of the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement in YETP with evaluation of career education in the LEA. The basic question we can then ask is "WHAT SERVICES ARE PROVIDED FROM WHOM, AND HOW GOOD ARE THE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM EACH PART?"

How would you know if a YETP/LEA Prime Sponsor agreement "works"?

Al: To answer that, we must somehow gain access to records of participating youth. We can make a release to do this part of the application the enrollee signs.

Joe D.: With the "10 percent YETP component," we are dealing with special needs kids. We sent a letter to parents of these kids asking them to agree to release records to CETA for use in evaluation.

Walt: We are looking at: (1) attendance data, (2) grade point averages, and (3) tardiness records. In addition, we have pre-post measures on career awareness and career decisionmaking (using our own "homemade" instruments).

Rita: The trouble with most standardized measures for career awareness and general employability skills is that they are too hard for our YETP youth to read.

Bette: The work site supervisor should be involved in the evaluation process. We should (a) evaluate the work site supervisor; and (b) involve the work site supervisor in evaluating the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. This can be done at the same time.

Rita: In our OJT contract, the work site supervisor makes student evaluations every two weeks.

Joe D.: I am going to start giving out certificates of appreciation to our work site supervisors. They do a grand job.

Bette: WATCH THAT. The Department of Labor would not like to see its money being spent on things like a "recognition dinner" for work site supervisors. Instead, they value having a maximum percent of the money spent on youth wages. ANYTHING ELSE IS SUSPECT. Part of the "psychology" behind this comes from the old NYC days.

Joe D.: We have got to be able to think about YETP as a long-term investment in economically disadvantaged youth. If we do not, we are asking for long-term failures!

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 122

LEA/CETA Agreements Approved by the Youth Council

March 29 and 30, 1979

Participants

Dr. Geraldine H. Plumb
Coordinator of Federal Programs
The Independent School District
of Boise City
Boise, Idaho

Ms. Gaetha Lloyd
Ada County Employment and
Training
Boise, Idaho

Mr. Grant Wickard
Manager, Youth Employment
Training Program
Denver Public Schools
Denver, Colorado

Ms. Janet J. Swift
Youth Programs Planner
Denver Employment and Training
Administration
Denver, Colorado

Ms. Saundra Vallejo
Coordinator, Career Awareness Program
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Mr. Ron Wayman
Division Head, Planning and
Contracting Division
Human Resources Department
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Mr. George Clanton
Supervising Director of Community
and Industrial Relations
District of Columbia Public Schools
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Ida T. Willis
Chief, Youth Programs Branch
Office of Employability
Development
D.C. Department of Labor
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Elaine Metzger
Director of Planning - CETA
Bridgeport, Connecticut

Observers

Ms. Fannie Bailey
Consultant, Career Awareness and
Information Program
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Ms. Nancy Borkow
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. E. Niel Carey
Coordinator of Career Education
Maryland State Department of Education
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief
State School Officers
Washington, D.C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to get true commitments to serving economically disadvantaged youth from both Prime Sponsors and from LEAs.

2. How to solve the dual "red tape" problems.

3. How to overcome prejudices LEAs and Prime Sponsors have about each other.

4. How to establish a communication system so that Prime Sponsors and LEAs can know whom to call to get an answer when it is needed.

5. How to get sufficient lead time prior to beginning a program to learn the basic parameters around which you can operate.

6. How to coordinate the YETP effort with related existing programs.

7. How to get clarification on the meaning of YETP rules and regulations.

8. What are the appropriate roles of the Prime Sponsor, the program operators, and educators in making YETP work?

9. How to conceive and operate alternative programs that are built on needs of youth, not on needs of existing programs.

10. How to solve the problems that arise when Fiscal Years of the LEA and of the Prime Sponsor are different.

11. How to resolve the responsibility of LEAs to serve all students when YETP is limited to students in a particular income range.

12. How to overcome the bad public press of CETA.

13. How to solve the logistical problems of moving application papers for LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

14. How to get a high enough priority for YETP among Prime Sponsors so as to get sufficient staff to perform the necessary monitoring function.

15. How to identify and/or build the expertise required to make YETP work.

16. How to gain interest of LEAs in participating in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

17. How can YETP best serve youth under age 16?

18. How to give special attention to economically disadvantaged youth without further stigmatizing and isolating them from other youth.

19. How to get forward funding for YETP.

20. How to get financial, rather than non-financial, agreements for YETP.

21. How to operate an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement that allows individual contracts with youth.

22. How to develop good working relationships with school counselors in YETP operations.

23. How to simplify the paperwork requirements of YETP.

24. How to relate YETP jobs to career goals of youth.

25. How to resolve job responsibility differences between LEAs with financial, as opposed to non-financial, agreements.

26. How to get consistent policies within a Prime Sponsor area of LEA differences in awarding academic credit.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Gaetha Lloyd and Geraldine Plumb - Boise, Idaho

Gaetha (Prime Sponsor representative)

In reference to the LEA agreements approved by the Youth Council, the agreements are better understood if you know a little about our Youth Council. The Youth Council is a subcommittee of the Ada County Employment and Training Advisory Board. The Youth Council functions to make policy decisions and reviews funding proposals. The Council submits its recommendations to the Advisory Board and the Advisory Board in turn recommends to the County Commissioners.

From the monies allocated, the Youth Council decides how the money should be spent, and there are basically three options: (1) LEA--financial agreement; (2) LEA--non-financial agreement; (3) special projects. The third option refers primarily to CBO-managed programs, and Ada County has done very little with youth-related CBOs because of their lack of stability. The programs that the county supports in conjunction with two of the public schools and Boise State are both non-financial. The majority of the monies available through YETP are spent on in-school programs. Once the priorities are set by the Youth Council, a bidders conference is held for all those interested in responding to RFPs.

The focus of the in-school program is on four areas: (1) academic credit for work experience; (2) career information, guidance, and job seeking skills; (3) expanded private sector involvement; and (4) job creation through youth-operated projects.

The Youth Council must receive a "go ahead" from the Board and County Commissioners; once this permission is received, the Council issues RFPs through legal notice and by contacting youth-related agencies. The responses are reviewed and those selected are negotiated; the recommendations are brought before the Advisory Board and the Commissioners. Following the Commissioners' approval, responses are submitted to the State for further technical review. As you can see, this process takes time.

Question: How are you handling the 22 percent set-aside for the LEAs? The Advisory Board wrote the agreements with the intent of spending 100 percent on in-school programs.

Geraldine (LEA representative)

It is imperative that we involve administrators, especially building principals, in the YETP efforts. Administrative support represents a large initial step toward gaining the approval of the school board (not to be confused with the Advisory Board of the CETA Prime Sponsor). The school board is sensitive to the involvement of youth in employment programs, however, because we have generally worked to cover all of the bases. The school board has been supportive of the goals and objectives for the YETP program.

In my judgment, the Boise public schools have an excellent referral system which is only one element of our career education program. Our career programs have been strengthened by the placement of a career counselor in each high school. The career counselor manages a career orientation center located conveniently so that all students can make inquiries concerning career interests. The career orientation centers also are a place where students are able to take self-interest inventories and receive appropriate feedback from a counselor. The career counselor also serves as a resource for the classroom teacher.

Initially our problems were largely related to the granting of academic credit for paid work experience. Boise City Schools will grant academic credit for paid work experience under the following conditions:

(1) when the student is in an approved and existing Career/Vocational cooperative class; or

(2) when the student is a "special education" student and is in an approved "work experience" program administered by the pupil personnel division.

Because of existing programs which award credit for work experience, some of the resistance to the credit for paid work was dissipated. We have had paid work experience in the Boise public school programs for about 15 years. Credit is granted for work experience based on the following:

(1) career/vocational cooperative credit--one credit per semester for a minimum of 15 hours per week of work experience and one credit per semester for "related classroom training" of five hours per week.

(2) special education work experience credit--as approved by the pupil personnel department. This credit is applicable to a special education diploma only.

When non-financial programs are compared to financial programs, it appears that the quality of work experiences under the financial arrangement exceeds that of the non-financial arrangement. The result seems to be that the financial agreements appear to support experiences more compatible with the individual's EDP.

The State of Idaho has passed legislation cutting the expenditure of public monies in an effort similar to Proposition 13 in California.

With less money being made available to the schools, the schools have become reluctant to implement programs without adequate funding support. The time has passed when the public can dump programs on the schools and expect the schools to effectively carry out the program. Our central staff has been reduced as a result of this cut in public expenditures.

One last problem we are faced with is that academicians are constantly saying that we need to return to the basics and that career education is a frill.

Questions and Answers

Q - How many students do you serve?
A - We serve 30 students in the Boise public schools.

Q - Are your youth members of the Youth Council actively involved?
A - Yes, the youth are actively involved in the decision-making process on the Council. All of the youth are CETA-eligible.

Q - How are the youth serving on the Council selected?
A - I did not participate in the original process. They will be chosen by program operators in the future.

Q - What is the total number of hours a student must work in order to receive credit?
A - The student must work 15 hours per week for the entire semester; this is a very firm policy.

Q - Is the credit that is awarded an elective credit?
A - Yes, but understand that anything that the school district is willing to give credit for is academic credit. The credit cannot, with few exceptions, be used as a substitute for required courses.

Q - Is the ET Advisory Council "weighted" against CBOs?
A - No. CBOs have not shown a great deal of interest or stability; consequently the Advisory Board looks carefully at CBO involvement.

Q - How do you get around the regulations for CBO involvement?
A - We do have CBO involvement in non-YETP youth programs.

Q - Do you have a large disadvantaged population?
A - No. The average across all schools for Title I is approximately 12 percent.

Q - What is the unemployment rate?
A - The unemployment rate for the total population is about 2.5 to 3 percent. Among 14-15 year olds the unemployment rate is at its highest -- about 12-14 percent. We have 168 young women who are heads of households, and this presents a serious problem in terms of locating employment.

Ron Wayman and Saundra Vallejo - Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Ron (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our youth council is also a subcommittee of the Employment and Training Advisory Council. We have diverse representation on our youth council because we feel it is critical to understand the potential labor markets for our youth. Our council is made up of representatives from: the juvenile system; YMCA; YWCA; LEA; Chamber of Commerce; Civil Service; State Health/Manpower Planning; labor; youth services (city); and youth.

One problem as I see it is to direct youth to the proper training so that they can develop the skills and attitudes necessary to survive in the private sector. The only way this can be accomplished is to rely on those who are the "consumers" of the high school product -- that is, to rely more on what businesses are saying is needed for young people in terms of basic skills and knowledge. This is the reverse of the way we have operated for too long, where we permitted the high schools to tell the Prime Sponsors what programs were needed.

Generally, we are operating our youth programs with the intent of outreaching those typically hard to reach. We have a large Native American population which does receive funds from the national set-aside for Native Americans. However, the Native American Prime Sponsor has requested our assistance in trying to reach as many Native American youth as possible. The Oklahoma City Prime Sponsor has agreed to serve the overflow from the Native American Prime Sponsor; however, this overflow has not been very large.

Another typically hard to reach group is the Mexican-American population. The Native American population is hard to reach because it is transient and distrustful of the "system," while the Mexican-American population is hard to reach because it is growing so rapidly and has limited English-speaking ability. The rapid growth of the Mexican-American community has created the need to fund bilingual education, expanded counseling services and outreach.

The third youth population difficult to reach is that segment which has been adjudicated and placed in the custody of the juvenile justice system.

In an effort to better serve these three hard-to-reach populations (Native Americans, Mexican-Americans, and adjudicated youth), the Oklahoma City Prime Sponsor is focusing on providing appropriate work experience components, improved skill training, and the type of classroom instruction which expands career awareness. We have even gone so far as to use a voucher system to purchase training slots in programs not offered through our regular skill training programs. One example is the purchase of slots in a truck driving school.

I believe that the program offered by the Oklahoma public schools is the most successful in providing comprehensive services to CETA-eligible youth.

Saundra (LEA representative)

As others have indicated, the LEA must receive approval from the School Board prior to responding to a prime sponsor RFP. This approval process does create some timing problems. The Oklahoma City Public Schools' Career Awareness and Information Program includes several phases:

- Registration to determine CETA eligibility of participants
- Aptitude assessment (the General Aptitude Interest Inventory) is administered, scored, and interpreted
- Inservices, such as having a representative of the State Employment Service instruct participants in properly completing job application forms
- On-site observations of local business and industry sites, to expose participants to careers in which they have expressed interest or aptitude
- Job development and placement in the private sector for as many participants as possible.

Since the program is funded by CETA, all participants must meet certain economic guidelines. The Oklahoma City public schools receive excellent community support; therefore, the school district is able to implement programs with relatively little resistance. The community is supportive because the schools provide the community with the assurance that the programs offered are of high quality, well supervised, and in the best interest of both the youth and the business community. The net result is that the youth in the YETP program are more attractive to employers than youth from other CETA programs because of the school's endorsement.

The schools have established the following linkages with the intent of better coordinating services:

1. Adult Institute - The Institute has a program for unwed students, and most of these students are CETA-eligible and definitely in need of a job.
2. Metro High - This is a program offered for those students suspended from the regular school program. The school is attempting to build a three-day per week classroom experience around a job.
3. City Park System - In an effort to reach school dropouts, the career awareness program has arranged with the park system to provide outreach opportunities to the youth.
4. Counselors working with Native American and Vietnamese youth - The schools accept referrals from the counselors working with both of these groups of youth, and some attempt is made to respond to their unique needs.

5. State Employment Office - The State Employment Office will give the GATB to those youth who are out of school, and the Employment Office will share information with the schools. Further, the schools have made it a practice to share their findings with the State Employment Office.

Counselors are overloaded and often tend to focus on the high achiever; therefore, almost any attention we give to the other youth provides a glimmer of hope.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you have a problem with the Native American population moving on and off the reservation?
A - We are not faced with that problem in Oklahoma because we do not have reservations; however, the Native American population is very transient.

Q - Do you have any linkages with volunteer groups?
A - Yes, we are presently working with a public service sorority which has been helpful in providing needed transportation for program participants. The schools have also worked with many church groups. By working with a wide range of volunteer groups, we feel that we are able to counter the bad press often received by the CETA programs.

Q - Are the schools the only group funded under YETP?
A - No. The schools receive the 22 percent allocated for in-school programs, but the rest of the money (78 percent) is made available to the CBOs. The Prime Sponsor is in the process of taking a long look at the YETP program to determine what program has the greatest demonstrated effectiveness. We are inclined to feel that the public school programs will emerge as being the programs with the greatest demonstrated effectiveness. The schools have an excellent reputation.

Q - How many youth are you serving?
A - 300 planned; 214 actual.

Ida Willis and George Clanton - Washington, D.C.

Ida (Prime Sponsor representative)

The Washington, D.C. Government operates as the Prime Sponsor. The D.C. Department of Labor administers the YETP program, which has about $1.5 million dollars available on the basis of the funding formula. Under the YETP program the District works with CBOs, public agencies other than the schools, and the LEA. At the present time the District has contracts, under YETP, with nine CBOs, two public agencies, and the LEA. The D.C. Department of Labor subcontracts with the Human Resource Department for services to incarcerated youth. While being detained, the youth are able to involve themselves in a program that pays minimum wages; however, the primary problem is that an incarcerated youth often may be released from the institution before completing the training cycle.

The District uses program monitors to provide technical assistance, counseling, and subgrant negotiations.

Youth are selected to participate in the youth CETA programs through the following process: first, a job order is sent to Employment Security which is part of the D.C. Department of Labor; next, the Employment Security Office selects the youth to be interviewed by the service agency (subgrantee); finally, the youth are either accepted or rejected by the service agency. Recruiting youth is not an issue because the Employment Security Office registers and enrolls the youth. The in-school youth participants receive minimum wages.

The schools are receiving 22 percent as mandated under the YETP provisions, but this money is channelled to the schools in two programs through two distinct subgrants.

One subgrantee, the UDC, provides classroom training. The participants receive allowances, not wages, because of the classroom nature of the program.

George (LEA representative)

The D.C. Public Schools System is divided into four divisions: (1) Instructional Services, (2) Special Education, (3) Career Development, and (4) Adult and Continuing Education. During the first year of funding, the money from the D.C. Prime Sponsor went to the Career Development division, and the Career Development division made some of these monies available to the ACE division. However, this year there are two separate grants: (1) the Adult and Continuing Education division receives money to support a job placement effort; (2) the Career Development Division receives money to fund project FOCUS which helps to prepare youths for their entry into the world of work. In addition to the two school programs, we have programs offered by the Department of Human Resources for institutionalized youth and programs offered by the Department of Corrections for incarcerated youth. In both situations the youths receive minimum wages just as if they were on the "outside." The training is offered in six-month cycles but, as was alluded to earlier, many youth are released out of synch with the training cycle.

Questions and Answers

Q - Have you tried OJT in the YETP program?
A - No. Our OJT effort is funded under the old Title I programs, now Title II of CETA.

Q - Can your monitors modify programs?
A - No. The monitors are not authorized to modify programs, but they are involved in the negotiation of contracts. Monitors are providing technical assistance at the present time; however, this will not be permitted under the new regulations.

Q - Does the Office of Employment Security refer students one at a time?
A - Yes, the Employment Security Office refers the youth one at a time until the slots are filled.

Q - Are you using the same eligibility forms for both the adult and youth programs?
A - Yes, we are using the same eligibility forms.

Q - Are the jobs pre-planned and the youths asked to meet the needs of the job, or do the youths' needs determine the job?
A - Employment Security has an EDP on all registrants. Using the EDP as a basis, it is much easier to design a job around the needs of youth than it is around the needs of an adult. In most instances the adult is faced with a less flexible labor market.

Elaine Metzger - Bridgeport, Connecticut

Elaine (Prime Sponsor representative)

The Bridgeport Consortium serves the city of Bridgeport and six surrounding counties. Therefore, the diversity of youth served stretches from the inner city to the suburban/rural areas. There are 14 YETP programs operated by the consortium; eight are in Bridgeport, and there is one in each of the surrounding communities. Two of the programs are service programs for in-school and out-of-school youth who are in YETP. These services are: (1) Cooperative Individualized Remedial Program, which offers Career Education and Remedial Reading; (2) Goodwill Industries Job Bank, which offers complete assessment and evaluation of all YCCIP and YETP participants. The 10 in-school programs offer the following activities: (1) career employment experiences, (2) services to participants, and (3) training of participants in cooperation with the LEA.

Of the 11 agreements the Consortium Prime Sponsor has signed with the LEAs, only one is a financial agreement -- the agreement with the Bridgeport public schools. Seven of the LEA agreements provide academic credit for the career employment experience, in addition to vocational and career counseling. The remaining four provide only vocational and career counseling. The Bridgeport schools are trying to make arrangements whereby students can receive partial credit for partial participation; in other words, students would not be required to be enrolled throughout the entire program. This avoids the all-or-nothing approach. Bridgeport has been receptive to the notion of academic credit for work experience primarily because of its history of having a large number of federally sponsored training programs. This is not really a totally new experience. The YETP program serves 537 students.

The Prime Sponsor, the Bridgeport Consortium, has centralized intake for youth in the City of Bridgeport. Separate intakes are conducted by each of the surrounding communites.

The best feature of this program is that the Prime Sponsor is now searching for a way to develop a blanket agreement which will hopefully be adopted by the remainder of the Consortium. Such an arrangement would provide for one intake system. We are experiencing some difficulty in defining the rules of Prime Sponsors, program operators, and educators, as well as defining what constitutes academic credit. In the City of Bridgeport there is good cooperation between the various CBOs (program operators) and the CETA Prime Sponsor, but the relations between the LEA and the Prime Sponsor are strained.

Questions and Answers

Q - How do you recruit youth? How do the youth get access to the central intake system?

A - We have established "out" stations in the community. These "out" stations are located in places where the youth are likely to spend time. For example, a recreation center or a housing project is a place where youth will spend time. Transportation is provided from the "out" stations to the Employment Security intake center. The "out" stations are operated by CBOs and are CETA-funded.

Q - Do the youth from the surrounding area come into Bridgeport to participate in the YETP program?

A - No. The distance between each of the towns is approximately seven miles; as a result, each town conducts its own intake process. All of the participating communities in the Consortium are within the same county, yet each is very separate. This separateness or independence causes several communities to threaten to withdraw occasionally. Who knows what will happen after 1980 when the CETA Consortium bonuses will be eliminated? One thing is certain: in Bridgeport, the initiative is taken by the Prime Sponsor to tell the LEA what credit should be given.

George: I am not familiar with a good system of awarding academic credit by a CBO. Does anyone know of such efforts?

Niel: In Baltimore they have developed a checklist which each employer and CBO must complete and send to the school system.

George: It appears to me that the issue of academic credit is largely one of competency vs. length of time devoted to an activity.

Ida: It would help a great deal if the schools were able to clarify what types of training they were willing to sanction as legitimate for receiving academic credit.

Niel: Maryland has gone to a State diploma; nine work experience credits can go toward graduation. This results in a great deal of flexibility in awarding academic credit.

Grant: In Denver we do award academic credit for work experience. A youth can receive five semester hours of credit for 500 hours of work experience. The student involved in the executive internship program can receive "academic" credit based on the type of experience and the activities in the intern program.

Jan Swift and Grant Wickard - Denver, Colorado

Jan (Prime Sponsor representative)

The Prime Sponsor, the Denver Employment and Training Administration (DETA), has just changed from a Prime Sponsor which operated its own programs to one which subcontracts for services. DETA receives approximately $39 million from CETA; the largest portion is for the Entitlements program. The Prime Sponsor receives about $1.3 million for the YETP program.

The Prime Sponsor has divided the area into four quadrants to provide a better delivery system and to aid in the subcontracting of services. The Prime Sponsor has also developed a centralized intake system.

The Youth Council was originally made up of 27 people, but during the stages of YETP there were only two students on the Council. This has changed; there are now 16 members on the Youth Council, and nine members are youth. All of the nine youth are CETA-eligible youth and youth representatives are selected from each youth program. A representative from industry chairs the Council and remaining adults represent CBOs, the LEA, labor, and industry.

The Council is very active, with a slight problem of attendance on the part of the youth. Some of the attendance problem is the result of transportation needs; consequently, the Prime Sponsor is examining the possibility of paying the youth a stipend to participate on the Council, as well as using a system of alternates with the possibility of sharing the voting.

The LEA agreement was developed primarily by the Youth Council, and the LEA is receiving 52 percent of the funding when you include the wages and fringe benefits paid to the students. The Prime Sponsor has contracted 50 OJT slots to a CBO and 60 work experience slots to serve those youth who have dropped out of school. We are just beginning to overcome the negative reaction which says, "Why should we pay for them to fail again?"

The youth on the Youth Council have recommended programs of job match, peer preparation, peer information service, and peers training peers in job search activities. We would like to run this program through Employment Security so that we can utilize their job bank located in the public libraries.

Grant (LEA representative)

Beginning this past January, the schools initiated a YETP program for 14-15 year olds. The program began with visits to each of the 18 junior high schools to discuss the program with the building principals. Each principal was asked to appoint an in-school program manager, and each manager would receive five additional hours of pay each week to work with the Denver Public School YETP Team. The first YETP Team meeting was held at the Career Education Center as a means to acquaint the participants with the Career Education Resource Center available at CEC.

There are three main components of the program:

1. Job experience in the non-profit sector subsidized at the minimum wage level.
2. Career development efforts which attempt to encourage the participants to identify career interests and work toward achieving career goals.
3. Health Screening and Referral to detect any health deficiencies. This service is generally provided by a nurse practitioner.

We had very little difficulty locating the 200 allocated job slots. The original screening was slated to be done at each of the four quadrant centers. However, transportation was a problem, so the screening was done at the junior high schools.

The objective of the YETP program for the 14-15 year olds is to help the youth identify their career interests and to give them a chance to explore what it is like to work in several different settings. Each in-school manager is responsible for locating the jobs for the youth and for maintaining contact with the job supervisor. A folder is kept on each student as a means of highlighting that person's progress.

In an effort to obtain an early reading of the students' interests, the Picture Interest Exploration Survey (PIES) is administered to each student. The benefits of the PIES are that it is quick and does not require reading ability. An impression may be all that is needed because it is too difficult to match interests with jobs for youth in junior high, due to their lack of maturity. Therefore, it may be more important to emphasize those things applicable to all job situations, such as a good attitude.

Questions and Answers

Q - Does PIES have an answer sheet?
A - Yes, and you are able to determine career groupings.

Q - How do you coordinate your in-school program with the academic requirements of the junior high?

A - This is a very difficult problem, and each building manager is working to create the best fit in each case.

Jan: DETA operates an alternative school for adults. The Opportunity School helps anyone interested in achieving a GED to do so. It is easier for in-school programs to give academic credit. If the requirement for the 22 percent is put in place, why does not the Federal level also mandate the awarding of academic credit?

THREE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to give special attention to economically disadvantaged youth without further stigmatizing and isolating them from other youth.
- How to get forward funding for YETP.
- What are the appropriate roles of the Prime Sponsor, the program operators, and educators in making YETP work?

Issue: How to give special attention to economically disadvantaged youth without further stigmatizing and isolating them from other youth

Ron: We need to give career education to all students. By serving only a particular segment, you (a) fail to meet the needs of all and (b) further stigmatize those you do serve. Maybe there are not enough Federal resources to serve all those who need career education, but there should be.

Gaetha: Solution #1: This year, we wrote a financial agreement with the Boise schools aimed at integrating their existing career education effort with their YETP effort. The idea behind it was that LEAs were not paying enough attention to YETP. This year, we have an experiment in which we are going to compare (a) cost effectiveness and (b) quality of job sites of this arrangement with those done under our regular non-financial agreement.

Gerry: In addition to the career education/YETP linkage, we are also trying to link YETP with our special needs program in vocational education.

George: What is the difference between a financial and a non-financial agreement?

Gaetha: In a financial agreement, we pay school staff to do the work. In a non-financial agreement, certification of youth is done by the schools, others carry out the work under YETP.

Elaine: I have heard that, in YETP, only financial agreements will be allowed in the future.

Gaetha: Both will be allowed.

Gerry: MORE ON SOLUTION #1: We help avoid stigmatizing the YETP enrollees by including them in our regular career education program; in this program, we already had a built-in component of paid work experience in the private sector.

The only difference is that YETP youth are referred to our Department of Employment for eligibility certification. It might help if we had a YETP certification counselor on site at the school.

Grant: SOLUTION #2: We have a class for 9th and 10th graders called "cooperative work experience." It is especially designed for potential dropouts, but open to youth from all socio-economic levels. This course is funded under State vocational education funds, but these funds are apparently going to be cut off next year. We have been discussing possibilities of making this course part of our in-school YETP effort next year.

Jan: If you presented your plan in that way, the Prime Sponsor would consider it supplementation which, to CETA, is a "NO-NO." However, we could do what you suggest under the "10 percent" special part of YETP. To date, we have not tried the "10 percent for youth from all socio-economic levels" approach because we have had enough trouble just trying to get the basic job done. The problem is one of how you put it down in writing. If you use the right words, there is very little you cannot do under YETP and still be legal.

Jan: SOLUTION #3: Both LEAs and CETA Prime Sponsors have to face risks in their efforts to help all students while giving the special attention needed by our most economically disadvantaged youth. I have a distinct feeling that LEAs are still not serving well those youth most in need. CETA persons are suspicious of linking too closely with existing career education programs which are apparently set up and run to serve the "nondisadvantaged."

It would be a risk for the Prime Sponsor to tie in directly with the LEA's career education program. On the other hand, many LEAs are super sensitive to the fact that, in the eyes of many, CETA is a "tainted" operation. It would be a risk for the LEA to tie one of its priority programs directly in with YETP. THIS IS A TWO-WAY "RISK" SITUATION AND MUST BE SO RECOGNIZED.

George: One of our Washington, D.C., school programs is FOCUS (Future Occupations and Careers For Urban Students). This is a 9th grade program designed for all students and aimed at giving them basic information about the world of work. We would like to see a component of exploratory work experience built into the FOCUS program for all students, not just for those in YETP.

Ida: SOLUTION #4: FOCUS is properly funded under the YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement as a "transition service" activity. It is in the 14-15 year old age group without economic eligibility restrictions, but only ES certified enrollees are eligible to participate in the career exposure portion of the out-of-school work experience.

Gaetha: SOLUTION #5: The Idaho Prime Sponsor has a career information van paid for out of CETA Title II-B funds that goes around from school to school and is available for use by all students. At present, we are getting some objections from our Department of Labor Regional Office, which would like to see use of this van limited to CETA-eligible persons only.

Ron: SOLUTION #6: Section 680.9 of the new YETP rules and regulations says that non-economically disadvantaged youth may be eligible, under YETP, for such things as counseling, occupational information, efforts to reduce stereotyping, etc. -- almost everything but work experience. It would be helpful if we could get more CETA Prime Sponsors to recognize this when LEAs try to negotiate LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements with them.

Jan: The concern of the Prime Sponsor is that schools are not really meeting the needs of the economically disadvantaged.

Fannie: The concern is to be sure that we will have an effective program. This means we have to pick the right people to run it. Because educators are so slow to change, it may be that a possible SOLUTION #7 would be to employ some non-educators who are more flexible in the schools and who can run the YETP effort in ways that do not stigmatize the kids. To do this, such persons need to be able to relate effectively with the building principal.

YETP youth need to be convinced that they are SPECIAL, not that they are POOR.

Non-educators can be accepted by educators in a school if the educators are convinced the non-educators have ways to be helpful to them. We start with a needs assessment/interest inventory for our middle school students. After they reach high school, we give them the GATB. Both of these things are done by "CAREER SPONSORS" (non-educators paid for out of YETP funds). The school counselors find the instruments our "career sponsors" give to be useful counseling tools for them. Under our YETP plan of operation, only YETP enrollees are eligible to take these special tests.

To make our YETP enrollees feel "special" (rather than "poor"), we plan things for them that really give them special attention. For example, we had our YETP enrollees go on a series of on-site visits to business/industry settings during our recent spring break. People at those site visits paid attention to these youth, answered their questions, and really made them feel important.

Elaine: We do not have this problem in Bridgeport. Our YETP enrollees have to operate, in terms of attendance and other related matters, in ways consistent with all others in the regular school program. They are not treated as "special" except in terms of YETP operations.

Jan: SOLUTION #8: Consider publicizing the YETP effort in terms of meeting the ethnic goals of the LEAs; this may give it better acceptance among educators. Recognize that YETP enrollees consist mostly of non-white youth. The school system must have goals related to providing suitable programs that take ethnic backgrounds of students into account. This would be one way of getting YETP better understood and accepted by educators as a vehicle for use in helping the LEA do what it must do anyway.

Saundra: Only CETA-eligible youth are being served by our Career Awareness Program, in terms of the special testing Fannie talked about. Further, "YETP eligibility" is determined by the Employment Security Commission staff persons who are located at the Prime Sponsor Office. One of our main problems is logistical: moving the CETA application through the Prime Sponsor system. At this time the Career Awareness Program has approximately 150 applications bottle-necked somewhere in the system. Efforts to clear this up have been unsuccessful.

Issue: How to get forward funding for YETP

Gerry: I have had a lot of experience with Title I, Elementary Secondary Education Act. In the early years, we never knew whether we were going to be funded until about October of each school year. With the aid of a lot of lobbying from groups such as the PTA, NSBA, etc., Congress finally changed ESEA to a forward funding cycle. Now, each May, we receive notice telling us how much Title I ESEA money we are going to have for the next school year. As a result, we can now plan our Title I activities with the total plans for our school system's operation.

Fannie: We have been through the same kind of thing in the Oklahoma City School District. Our Federal Grants person now knows pretty well, even before May, about how much Title I money will be coming so that we can do our planning even prior to receiving notice in May.

Gaetha: To take this example back to our situation in YETP, we have a situation where our YETP Youth Council meets in May and plans, in terms of percentage allocations, the relative amount of whatever YETP funds received will be spent on each of several parts of YETP in the coming Fiscal Year. Thus, the notion of forward planning does exist in YETP even though forward funding, in a technical sense, does not.

Elaine: In Bridgeport, we know we can carry over 10 percent of the current YETP funds into the next Fiscal Year. This is, I believe, true nationwide.

George: Can the LEA carry over this 10 percent? Answer: NO. The Prime Sponsor has these "carry over" funds but with no necessary commitment to any LEA now operating under a current LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

Niel: Is there anything in the YETP rules and regulations that would prevent these 10 percent "carry over" funds from being built into the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement when that agreement is made? Answer: There is nothing in YETP rules and regulations that prevents sub-grantees (such as LEAs) from carrying over money, provided it is properly accounted for and does not represent an unreasonable percent of the total grant or contract funds.

Gaetha: For an LEA which had a formal LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement last year, the Prime Sponsor could modify that agreement, when the school year starts, out of current funds. The Prime Sponsor could simultaneously make a commitment to the LEA, with a "provided funds are available" clause, for the next Fiscal Year. For example, our Youth Council will know, by June, what its priorities are for the coming year. Thus, it could notify a particular LEA that is high on its priority list that probabilities of being funded for the coming Fiscal Year are very high.

Niel: What about an LEA which signs with a Prime Sponsor for the first time an agreement that is due to begin on October 1 of a given Fiscal Year? Is there any way that LEA could start in September when the school year begins?

Gaetha: A Prime Sponsor could write a one-month contract using "lapse funds" from the preceding Fiscal Year. But this, of course, should be done only if the Youth Council has made a firm decision to fund that LEA in the coming Fiscal Year. That is, a one-month contract that began in September and ended on October 1 (if not followed by a one-year contract) would simply widen the distrust and negative image many LEAs already have of CETA operations.

Jan: AGREE WITH GAETHA. Remember, membership on the Youth Council changes with each new Fiscal Year; appointments are made annually by whoever happens to be Mayor that year. Thus, a commitment made by one Youth Council does not necessarily have to be honored by the next Youth Council.

Ron: We make our Youth Council appointments in July. We can and do make re-appointments of good Youth Council members. While appointments are made annually, the possibilities for re-appointments give us some promise of continuity that we take advantage of in the case of our good members.

George: Operationally, at the LEA level, we really do not have any such thing as "carry over" funds for YETP. If the YETP program starts in September, it will operate on Prime Sponsor money from the past Fiscal Year. Starting October 1, if the new YETP money is not yet available and our LEA wants to continue the YETP effort, we must do so using our own LEA funds -- planning, of course, to replace those with YETP funds when the Prime Sponsor comes through. What we really need is some kind of "CONTINUING RESOLUTION" that tells the LEA of the Prime Sponsor's "INTENT TO FUND." At present, there is no good way our local Prime Sponsor can give our LEA such a notice of "intent to fund" because the Prime Sponsor has to wait until Congress makes an appropriation -- and, as your know, the Congress does not always make such appropriations in time to meet the October deadline. That is what happened to us last year.

Could we not, as a local matter, build, say, a 14-month LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement that would let the LEA start the next year and operate until the new funds become available? Answer: Yes, we could. But this holds the danger of damaging or destroying the weapons for use in making the best possible contracts -- whether they be with LEAs or with CBOs.

If a given project -- say, "PROJECT A" -- were funded for 14 months but did not work out well and, as a result, the Prime Sponsor decided to fund "PROJECT B" in the coming Fiscal Year, the Prime Sponsor could take the final two months of payments away from "PROJECT A" and give that money to "PROJECT B." All that is necessary is for the Prime Sponsor to put an "assurance of satisfactory performance" clause in the Project A contract.

Jan: The Prime Sponsor will be both willing and able to enter into firm future commitments with LEA in any given period of time when the Department of Labor is willing and able to make similarly firm commitments to the Prime Sponsor. So long as the Prime Sponsor lives in an "atmosphere of uncertainty" in terms of its relationships with the Department of Labor, it certainly makes "firm" commitments to LEAs in terms of LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

Issue: What are the appropriate roles of the Prime Sponsor, the program operators, and educators in making YETP work?

Elaine: One of our problems is deciding who is responsible for what in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. We are in the process of trying to establish a blanket agreement for our Consortium that will clarify these roles, with such clarification being accomplished cooperatively through interaction of all three of these groups. Our current draft proposal has resulted in the following breakdown of responsibilities:

Prime Sponsors will be responsible for:

- Serving as liaison between the Board of Education and the program operators (CBOs).
- Acting as the funding agent.
- Providing monitoring and technical assistance.

The Board of Education will be responsible for:

- Orienting youth to YETP.
- Operating an LEA vocational education effort.
- Operating an LEA career education effort.
- Determining criteria for use in awarding academic credit for YETP experiences.
- Determining criteria for identifying potential high school dropouts.
- Providing a Coordinator paid by LEA funds to coordinate between LEAs and program operators.
- Selecting "liaison persons" (unpaid volunteers) at the building level who will attend monthly meetings of the Program Operators/Prime Sponsor/ Board of Education.
- Justifying the work sites in terms of career goals of YETP youth.
- Providing transitional services to YETP and to YCCIP youth only.
- Providing literacy and bilingual training for YETP and YCCIP enrollees.
- Providing GED, adult education credit, and transitional services for out-of-school YETP youth.
- Providing summer school opportunities (including SPEDY) to YETP youth.

Program Operators (CBOs) will be responsible for:

- Orientation of youth they serve to YETP.
- Job development.
- Job placement.
- Job counseling.
- Coordinating their activities with the Board of Education.
- Providing job skills.
- Providing labor market information.
- Providing job sampling activities.
- Providing subsidized employment opportunities.
- Rules and regulations.
- Evaluation.

NOTE: Under this agreement, the LEA receives $21,000 out of a total of $148,000 of YETP funds. This buys the services of one LEA person to act as a "coordinator."

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 123
Academic Credit for Work Experience
April 3 and 4, 1979

Participants

Ms. Ellen Earley
Site Coordinator - Career Planning
Guidance Counselor
South Burlington High School
South Burlington, Vermont

Mr. John Horn
Program Coordinator for
Diversified Occupations
Orange County Public Schools
Orlando, Florida

Mr Ron Finnegan
Project Director - CYET
St. Paul Independent School
District #625 - Baker School
St. Paul Minnesota

Mr. Howard Ribble
Program Administrator - CETA
Orlando, Florida

Ms. Jacqui Shoholm
Youth Representative
City of St. Paul
Division of Manpower Programs
St. Paul, Minnesota

Mr. Victor K. Trice
Manpower Analyst
Louisville, Kentucky

Ms. Barbara Preli
Career Education Coordinator
Jefferson County Schools
Brown Education Center
Louisville, Kentucky

Observer

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to help educators understand CETA and vice versa.

2. How to help educators and CETA personnel understand each other's language.

3. How to link dollars rather than isolating them into separate "turfdoms" (i.e., avoiding duplication).

4. How to put maximum emphasis on providing direct service to youth.

5. How to make administrative budget decisions both efficient and effective in YETP.

6. How to gain local credibility for YETP in light of the fact it is a Federal program.

7. How to get positive public relations for YETP as a preventive/developmental effort with direct goals.

8. How to make YETP funding operate in a timely way.

9. How to integrate YETP with LEA efforts in career education, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, and other LEA activities.

10. How to get a better community view of what education is.

11. How to help the community understand that YETP can lead to improvements in the school system.

12. How to get valid input from the grass roots prior to enactment of YEDPA revisions.

13. How to get a set-aside for YCCIP similar to what now exists for YETP.

14. What happens to YETP efforts after federal funds run out?

15. How to get effective linkages between school boards and Prime Sponsors on a sustaining basis -- interfacing or intrafacing.

16. How to get CETA Prime Sponsors to view school boards in a more positive light.

17. How to devise and utilize effective and appropriate indicators of demonstrated effectiveness of YETP applicable to CBOs as well as to LEAs.

18. How to identify valid CBOs for use in YETP.

19. What happens to YETP enrollees who are terminated before finishing?

20. How important is the need for minimum wage as an aspect of the YETP in-school program?

21. How can an effective YETP effort be implemented for 14-15 year olds?

22. How can LEA efforts be mounted that will make younger children more ready for YETP participation?

23. How can YETP be made more of an effort that takes place during the school day rather than after school?

24. How can YETP meet the needs of non-economically disadvantaged youth?

25. How can the red tape problems of YETP be reduced?

26. Can YETP efforts that do not involve allowances/wages be made viable?

27. How to help YETP youth learn to serve effectively on Youth Councils.

28. How can peer influence be used as a positive force in YETP?

29. How can YETP efforts with total lifestyle implications be implemented?

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Ellen Earley - South Burlington, Vermont

Ellen (LEA representative)

We have one of the "10 percent experimental YETP" efforts. Originally written by CETA to focus on dropouts, it was turning LEAs off. We rewrote it to fit more neatly into career education. This gave it much more acceptance.

The original idea was to have no adults involved in running the effort, except a Project Director. Using college students, we wanted to prevent dropouts.

The program has three phases: (a) self-awareness, (b) career exploration, and (c) summer shadowing.

Each student spends five hours per week paid at minimum wage.

The program uses three sites: (a) Rural setting -- everyone YETP-income eligible (26), (b) Rural setting -- 18 non-income eligible and eight income-eligible, (c) Urban setting -- 18 high risk dropouts, six other positive students, and two college students who act as tutors -- 18 non-income eligible and eight income-eligible.

In the rural sites, anyone who volunteered was taken in. In the South Burlington site, we tried to identify real potential dropouts. It is an after-school program which, for only five hours per week, is not appealing to some of these youth.

We have tried to precede career exploration with self-assessment, using the group process to keep it going.

We have no alternative school programs. Thus, we had to find a way of keeping kids involved.

Of the 18 in South Burlington identified as "high potential dropouts," five have dropped out.

Students are vague as to why CETA would pay them five hours a week for the career assessment things. They understand better as we get into career exploration.

Main problems:

- It was generated outside the group;
- The most needy kids are turned off from a group setting;

- The pay is insufficient because of the short time working per week;
- Five hours per week is not enough time;
- Doing it after school is negative. We add two and a half hours to their school day every Tuesday and Thursday;
- They come in with a lack of skills;
- Twenty-six is too big a group to work with well in group process;
- Kids felt too much testing went on early in the program;
- Reading skills of students are too low to take some of the tests;
- Use of drugs and alcohol -- kids decided anybody "stoned" may not come in.

In all three settings more women than men are involved. The most cohesive group is the rural site where all youth are YETP income-eligible.

We are trying our "career planning project" under YETP as a lab for teacher inservice for learning about career education in direct link with our Department of Child Education-funded career education project. I would like to see it move right into the school for credit. That is being done now in Portland, Maine.

Our age group is 14-19.

Questions and Answers

Q - What are the differences in attitudes between income-eligible and non-income eligible youth?
A - You can not even tell which kid is which. The kids are beginning to mix with each other.

Q - Don't you have to match these 26 kids against YETP regular enrollees in your Prime Sponsor area?
A - They are doing it using "Smoky House" project in southern Vermont as a control group.

Q - How were kids selected?
A - Counselors helped identify kids in South Burlington. Other sites advertised for participants.

Q - Are you getting funds under the Governor's set-aside?
A - Unsure.

Q - What is the difference in the 26 kids in your second rural setting (18 and eight) and the South Burlington (18 and eight)?
A - In South Burlington, eight of the 26 have to be YETP income-eligible but they could be in either group. There is actually no difference, except setting.

Q - What do you hope to learn from this?
A - Since we are going to be able to do "shadowing" rather than regular work experience, we will learn. In addition, we will learn something about the viability of only five hours a week. Finally, we will learn something about kids being able to influence each other. Also, we will learn about the pros and cons of homogeneous grouping as opposed to mixing income-eligible students with non-income eligible students.

Q - Have you done anything in sex role stereotyping?
A - Not yet.

Q - Are these kids getting academic credit?
A - If they are interested, they could get it -- but no one has applied.

Q - Why are you doing it after school?
A - Because they cannot get paid for taking a course during the school day. If it was work experience during the school day, they could get paid.

John Horn and Howard Ribble - Orlando, Florida

John (LEA representative)

School credit - We became concerned about what "academic credit" means. In our system "academic" means English, math, science, language arts -- not YETP courses.

There are two phases of school credit: (a) in-school (youth) and (b) out-of-school -- adult education.

Student participants take a coop-type program (work experience directed at potential dropouts is YETP): two class periods on work experience, one class period on employability skills, one period on providing specific vocational skill related to the job, and one or more periods on whatever else is needed to get a high school diploma.

The objectives are: (a) youth completes high school and (b) youth has an employable skill.

The out-of-school program includes: high school dropouts who want to return to school; those going through vocational assessment; and those needing training to get a GED diploma or to get specific job skills. For a course prescribed by law as a requirement for high school graduation, the SEA can recommend minimum standards to LEAs.

Orange County Schools conducted seminars on buses for kids who worked at Disney World -- not YETP but a good example of how you can get academic credit rules to fit a program that is a good idea.

Howard (Prime Sponsor representative)

Orange County itself is a Prime Sponsor, as is Orlando, so they combined into a consortium.

YEDPA has several different components including: (a) an in-school program -- paid work experience coupled with school; (b) a dropout program -- pre-apprentice kids who have returned to school for GED. It is sometimes hard to get these returning dropouts through GED.

Questions and Answers

Q - How many participants do you have?
A - One hundred and five, plus 20 for the apprentice program; these are on-board planned levels.

Q - What are you doing in transition services?
A - All transition and transfers have to go through the Prime Sponsor; they are becoming harder to get.

Q - Is your LEA/Prime Sponsor contract financial?
A - Yes. Fifty-six to fifty-eight percent of our YETP money is going to the LEA.

Q - Are you with the Prime Sponsor or the school system, Howard?
A - I was with the Prime Sponsor but now work with the Board of Education.

Q - Are you having most of your work experience in the public sector?
A - Yes. We use private sector only for OJT.

Q - How are you tying in with career education in Orange County?
A - We use the career education centers in each school; we use career education for teaching employability skills.

Q - How much of your YETP effort is getting academic credit?
A - One hundred percent of our enrollees are getting academic credit for employability skills taught, plus credit for work experience. From the beginning, we worked to get academic credit for YETP enrollees. We also have academic credit for YCCIP.

Victor Trice and Barbara Preli - Louisville, Kentucky

Barbara (LEA representative)

Jefferson County schools is the only LEA in the Prime Sponsor area.

Our YETP is tied in with career education directly, and serves 60 tenth, eleventh and twelfth graders -- a continuation of work seminar (with academic credit) and course work. Elective credit is given for work experience.

The program's goal is to either: (a) place kids in part-time employment, or (b) further the kids' education.

The program has three components: (a) selection -- all economically disadvantaged; (b) one period seminar -- career choices, decision-making, employability skills; (c) two job experiences during the year -- many kids are afraid to change, so we are deliberately creating job changes.

Kids are placed in occupations related to their career goals in the private sector. (Because the job experience is short, kids do not replace adult workers.) Part of the agreement calls for kids to get career exploration in a variety of occupations in the industry.

We have a work site agreement plus a contract with the individual student.

Lots of personal individual counseling is involved.

We have had a good response from the private sector; there is no problem funding unsubsidized jobs after the one-year YETP experience has ended.

YETP kids do bi-weekly reports. They must attend school in the morning if they are to go to work in the afternoon. They work 12-16 hours per week during the school year and 36 hours per week during the summer.

After student selection, we do parent orientation for YETP enrollees. Many home visits are made.

Victor (Prime Sponsor representative)

The Prime Sponsor is the Louisville/Jefferson County Manpower.

We have another Title I work experience program still operating under the new Title II-B -- three agreements in all.

We have several CBOs operating in YETP.

Questions and Answers

Q - How much of the YETP money is in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement?
A - Twenty-two percent.

Q - How do you handle the 1:12 supervision ratio called for in the regulations?
A - We have in-kind contributions. Our work site agreement calls for the school principal to provide this supervision for in-school kids on work experience.

Q - How about transportation?
A - No problem. We run school buses. Our community is very positive about getting jobs for kids. We have a planning team that scrutinizes each CBO carefully; none gets it as a CBO unless it meets our planning procedures.

Q - How does your CETA Prime Sponsor get along with the politicians?
A - Its Director tells the politicians what the law is and insists that it be met.

Q - What kinds of positions do you have in the school under YETP?
A - Two consultants and one coordinator; each reports to the Director of Career Education.

Q - Are you planning to expand your YETP to more than one school?
A - Yes, we want to get a parochial school next year.

Q - For the total Title IV youth funds coming into Louisville, how are they split up?
A - As follows:

- YCCIP - two programs for 20 youths
- Community Action - ten youths tutoring other kids after school
- YMCA - vocational skill training for 22 youths
- Salvation Army Boys Club - journalism training - ten youths
- University of Louisville - Health Sciences - 51 youths
- Housing Authority - 18 youths
- Community Action Agency - 22 kids in senior citizen support training
- YETP - 60 in-school kids

Q - Has your regional office given you indication that YCCIP is dying?
A - Yes, but it is going to YETP. The other thing is that the provision for 14 year olds is going out.

Q - How did the LEA get hooked up with the Prime Sponsor?
A - Barbara was on the Youth Council.

Q - Was the fact that Louisville had a strong career education program helpful in getting YETP?
A - Yes. We still have to watch that CBOs get most of the money, even though CBOs do not write very good proposals. Because of our career education program, we had a good basis for building a strong evaluation element built into our LEA proposal.

Q - What problems are you having with CBOs?
A - The problem is getting adequate evaluations.

Ron Finnegan and Jacqui Shoholm - St. Paul, Minnesota

Ron (LEA representative)

Our youth programs are all coordinated with each other.

Our Youth Career Exploration Employment Project (YCEEP) is an in-school program funded under Title II-B. We have enrolled 450 youths during three years of career exploration.

SPEDY is funded under Title IV to provide 1,600 summer jobs and to extend our YCEEP effort over the summer.

The Governors Youth Program (GYP), can be interwoven with in-school and summer programs and is not limited strictly to economically disadvantaged. (Fifty percent can be non-economically disadvantaged.) These are state of Minnesota funds.

YCCIP has 50 enrollees, 25 on each of two projects. This summer, our SPEDY kids will help.

YETP enrolls 200 youths and is designed to get drop-out kids back to school. YETP funds are used to integrate CETA with an alternative school program (which is now funded by LEA and state-funded aid). Our YETP includes the following four components: (a) Career Studies Center, an LEA program for potential dropouts; (b) Red School House, CBO for Indians; (c) Fair Break Learning Center, operated by Control Data Corporation, for 50 kids in a PLATO computer education system; and (d) Urban League Street Academy, a CBO primarily for black youths.

All YETP kids work 15-20 hours per week. The 50 in the CDC component work there. Kids like the CDC program because (a) pay is greater, and (b) they like the computer learning approach.

Jacqui (Prime Sponsor representative)

In initiating YETP, YCCIP, and SPEDY, we have added only ten people to the six on CETA previously employed. We are trying to cut administrative costs by coordinating all youth programs with each other and with various CETA adult programs.

No CBO receives direct dollar support; all are non-financial agreements. We went through the school system to start with and have continued to build on the core program. CBOs can deliver services to kids and they are good work sites. But they can do it often within the framework of their ongoing programs. Many of the CBOs were in business before CETA came along with new money.

Questions and Answers

Q - Are you doing OJT under your youth program?
A - No, except for CDC. There is a potential for OJT, but the pie has not been big enough to split it this way yet. We have elected not to include OJT in our programming so far.

Q - What do you do in YETP in addition to the effort to get out-of-school youth back in school?
A - It is all for out-of-school kids, with one part aimed at getting them to finish high school and the other part giving them an in-school career employment experience.

Q - Why don't you switch your YCEEP program under Title II-B to YETP?
A - We wanted to use YETP to expand what we were doing in Title II-B. We could not replace Title I efforts with YETP but, rather, had to supplement what was previously being done for youth under the old Title I of CETA with new efforts under YEDPA of 1977.

Also, we still view YEDPA as a demonstration program. This is why we wanted to keep our Title I program going rather than trying to transfer it to YETP. If YEDPA does not continue we will be able to maintain the YCEEP portion of programming under the new Title II-B.

THREE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How can an effective YETP effort be implemented for 14-15 year olds?

- How important is the need for minimum wage as an aspect of the YETP in-school program?

- How to integrate YETP with LEA efforts in career education, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, and other LEA activities.

Issue: How can an effective YETP effort be implemented for 14-15 year olds?

John: The issue is societal; this group is locked out by today's child labor laws. We use the LEA to "babysit" these youth and keep them out of society's hair. These youth need to do adult-type things but we prevent that. As a result, by the time they reach 18 and we urge them to go to work, we have driven the desire to work out of them.

Howard: The YETP regulations provide for "exploratory" activities like shadowing, but it is a pretty worthless thing. "Hands-on" is much better than "stand-by." "Maturity" is tough to measure but I know I have seen some 14-15 year olds who are pretty mature. Under CETA regulations, it is tough not to pay participants.

Jacqui: I agree that the vocational exploration program (VEP) is an unworkable idea. We tried it two years ago through the National Alliance of Businessmen (NAB) and it did not work for us. The kids did not want to "shadow," and the private sector did not want them "hanging around." We did it through the public sector along with the Summer Youth Employment effort and it worked better. The only time we are serving 14-15 year olds is through SPEDY; that age group is contributing to some of the SPEDY "play for pay" criticisms we hear nationally. The original pre-YEDPA intent of SPEDY was to (a) provide summer jobs, (b) provide income, and (c) keep kids off the street. Only since YEDPA has SPEDY embraced some career development objectives, and I personally feel that such objectives in an 11-week program are unrealistic.

Ron: We started with Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) in 1965 as a dropout prevention program via work experience. As time went on, our summer program increased dramatically (with MDTA) to provide work experience and keep kids off the street -- no worry about academic credit. When CETA came in, we went back to a youth effort using Title I. So, when YEDPA was passed, it was easy for us to expand. The program has changed under YEDPA to emphasize work experience for academic credit for out-of-school kids.

Jacqui: Under YEDPA we got seed money to make our in-school and out-of-school youth programs more comprehensive. My experience in youth employment programs started as an NYC participant at age 14. I know what my needs were at that time, and I think while the objectives may have broadened, today's kids in a depressed economy have similar money needs. There are many kinds of work 14-15 years olds can do, especially during the summer, including for example:

- Summer Crews - Kids work outdoors for CBOs. They work along river fronts renovating park areas for community use. They build erosion devices, walking/jogging trails, etc. They use hand tools, so they do not break child labor laws (which would happen if they used machines).

- Vocational Learning Centers in the St. Paul School District - For example, we take 30 kids in a horticulture course where they learn greenhouse and gardening skills and get credit. Another example is that they build garbage can containers with hand tools in another vocational learning center and put the containers out in the community.

John: For in-school kids, fast food chains are heavy employers of youth; McDonald's used to hire mostly 14-15 year olds but has switched now for insurance reasons. Employers do not want the insurance problems that arise with 14-15 year olds. As a result, the 14-15 year olds get only the menial jobs.

Howard: In our area, if you draw $5.25 per hour, it is a good job. The $2.90 minimum wage is causing problems in the hiring of 14-15 year olds. If I had my choice of hiring a 20-22 year old or a 14-15 year old for $2.90 per hour, I would take the 20-22 year old. Our school system is exempt from paying the minimum wage for regular employees. This means some YETP youth working in the in-school programs are getting more money than some of our regular school employees. We have to establish a special category called "fed programs" to justify paying minimum wage to CETA enrollees while paying less to some regular school employees. Some regular school employees resent this.

Jacqui: Would use of allowances rather than wages get around this?

Howard: No.

Vic: We are thinking of 14-15 year olds more in a "learning" than in an "earning" sense. Thus, we rotate kids from one kind of experience to another during the summer for purposes of career exploration. During the school year, we have a tutoring program for younger kids in which we pay minimum wage to 14-15 year olds.

Issue: How important is the need for minimum wage as an aspect of the YETP in-school program?

John: We are talking about in-school youth, most of whom have never had in a job and have no experience. Employers are asking why these kids should get minimum wage when there are better qualified people all around who are now working for less than the minimum wage, (*i.e.*, through the special dispensation given the school district). Why not hire a 20 year old with more success potential?

Howard: We have 20 percent unemployment in Orange County. The average wage is $3.15 per hour. Twenty-five years ago, when I was trying to learn to be a printer, I worked for an employer who paid me $2.10 per week. It is wrong not to give these kids any wage, but maybe there ought to be a waiver of some kind that would let us pay kids less than the minimum wage. They would *still* be motivated to learn. At least it would work in Florida -- if not in the nation.

Ellen: If we pay YETP enrollees the minimum wage, would this put pressure on employers to pay others at least the minimum wage?

Howard: No. The restaurant business is a good example. Most restaurant employees have to depend on tips. Example two: until last year, senior citizen centers were exempt from being paid minimum wage. There *is* something to be said for paying less than the minimum wage to 14-16 year olds.

Ron: St. Paul had a similar situation; a few years ago some school system employees were getting less than the minimum wage. When youth CETA programs came in, they forced the school system to raise its adult employees to the minimum wage; *i.e.*, instead of pulling youth wages *down*, the result was to get adult wages *up*.

Howard: Maybe that would work in a highly unionized town but not in the deep South where unions are not strong. As one employer said, "The crick never runs dry! If you don't want to work for less than the minimum wage, I'll find someone who will!"

Ron: To me, it is defeating the purpose. Keeping people strictly at the minimum wage is almost guaranteed to keep them close to poverty level. The minimum wage was set for some good reasons and we should not try to change it.

Barbara: We have to look at the purposes of the youth part of CETA legislation -- i.e., to work developmentally with youth so they will not become unemployed adults. Employers are always complaining that schools are not giving them kids with good work habits who want to work. "Upward mobility" to many youth translates into money. The minimum wage is a big incentive to help youth develop into really employable adults. These youth do not have specific job skills, but through YETP, we can give them good work habits and good work values. They certainly deserve the minimum wage.

Vic: We have 40 percent unemployment among 16-21 year old youth. The average YETP kid works only 15-20 hours a week so, even with the minimum wage, these kids are not taking much money home -- and most of the homes these youth come from really need the money. To have these youth bring home some money results in upward mobility for the whole family -- not just for the youth. For example, a poverty family living in a low-cost housing project where a youth can get some money from YETP might encourage the mother to take advantage of what a CBO like OIC might do for her -- and, in time, the whole family might become more self-sufficient. YETP may help the whole family rise out of the poverty welfare cycle.

Jacqui: The long range potential for the upward mobility of the family is certainly there, but there are more immediate things to the youth. For example, the YETP income might be the only way our kids can afford to buy a dress for the prom, purchase a yearbook, or maybe buy lunch everyday and pay bus fare. The other side of the coin is that we have some YETP kids who are parents themselves. When NYC first came out, the NYC income lowered the AFDC grant to the family. That has now been changed in YETP because of an "income disregard" clause; YETP income is supposed to protect benefits under AFDC. However, where the "head of household" is a YETP youth, these kids' AFDC payments are being reduced -- at least under Minnesota law.

Vic: That would not apply in Kentucky.

Howard: John and I are not arguing about paying YETP youth $2.90 per hour or about the benefits. All we are doing is bringing out a local situation in Orange County. In our community, it is leading to increasing youth unemployment.

Jacqui: This would apply also in rural Minnesota. There should be options for adjusting the wage depending on the local situation.

Walt: What is the effect on a 14-15 year old kid who knows he is not really earning the minimum wage?

Jacqui: There are dangers in minimum wage -- or sub-minimum wage -- for 14-15 year olds. As an example, we had 14-15 year olds cutting three acres of grass by hand. Later that summer, they saw an adult on a tractor mowing the whole three acres in a few minutes. It made the youth angry to see that they had learned only to use hand tools when the work was done more easily by machine.

Vic: We have 18-19 year olds who have not yet learned to handle hand tools. The problem is basically that of the quality of work site supervision.

Ron: Back in the '60's, workmen's compensation was two percent of the gross payroll. Now it is up to five percent of the gross payroll. Years ago, our payroll was all youth. Now it is youth and adults. It is the adults who are claiming more injury that has raised the workmen's compensation rate. Our SPEDY kids in the summer are on a 1:10 supervisory basis, and their accident rate is far lower than the adults.

Barbara: The career education definition is not necessarily valuable to real poverty kids. They can move toward accepting the self-actualizing part of the definition only if they have enough money to move beyond the need for survival.

Jacqui: Generalization: There should be options with respect to minimum wage for 14-15 year old youth depending on such local conditions as rural prevailing wages versus urban, etc.

Vote: Yes - 3; No - 4.

Issue: How to integrate YETP with LEA efforts in career education, vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, and other LEA activities

Ron: The LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements should be set up so that LEA and CETA dollars will increase services to participants. As an example, we do not have people to man the career resource centers set up through career education in 1972. We can use PSE money under Title II-B or Title VI to train and employ adults to run these career resource centers. The Board of Education could continue such persons by using its P.L. 95-207 money.

Barbara: The school system could also pick it up if the role of the counselors is re-defined so they could run these career resource centers. LEA money is decreasing, and this is one way of redefining the counselor's role. Another option would be to use volunteers from business/labor/industry or from the county government.

Ron: We feel vocational education programs should fit in with our three-year YETP in-school program. If we do the pre-employment transition services properly through YETP, we should increase both the quality and quantity of kids enrolling in vocational education -- i.e., if we can make the YETP transition services part of the career education effort for high school tenth and eleventh graders.

Barbara: Most school systems do not have a master plan for giving all kids these general employability skills. Too often, they are seen as separate efforts of finite parts of the school district. Each department is trying to keep its own staff.

Jacqui: It is valid for career education people to see YETP money coming in for the same things career education is trying to do when career education funds are being cut. It gets back to turf and who feels he came up with the idea first.

John: My background is industrial arts. Industrial arts used to be considered as a part of general education; in recent years, however, it has been made part of vocational education. Industrial arts teachers are upset because they think vocational education will absorb them, the term "industrial arts" will disappear, and the industrial arts teacher will see his/her identity --and maybe his job -- disappear also. The individual identity of industrial arts is being lost, and that is a threat to the teacher's security.

Jacqui: When CETA came to St. Paul (in 1973), Ron, who formerly worked only with NYC, received funds directly from the Department of Labor. With the dissolution of categorical grants and the influx of CETA, Ron was asked to combine his efforts for youth employment; the City as Prime Sponsor became the middle man. That is, the key word in CETA was comprehensive so that the city could get away from all these separate categorical areas. More overall funds went to St. Paul, but some of the categorical positions that had formerly existed at the LEA level were abolished. Now YEDPA, including YETP, comes in as a comprehensive solution to youth programs, completely ignoring the fact that many LEAs had already established career education efforts under the local or Federal (HEW) initiatives.

Howard: When YETP started in Orange County, Florida, the Prime Sponsor did not even know career education existed. The prior relationships had been only with vocational education in terms of specific vocational skill training. We did, of course, use the schools in PSE and some in pre-apprenticeship programs. When YEDPA came along and we could see money coming (and an LEA agreement), we talked with the associate superintendent of the school system and asked how could we use it. We still had no contact with career education. Instead, another LEA person came to us with a proposal for the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. It looked reasonable to us, so we bought it. It did relate to career education, but no one in the LEA said that to us. This is a good example of the semantic breakdown.

John: Career education has a long history in our LEA, so that vocational education now thinks of it as a regular part of the program. The director of career education was so busy trying to infuse career education concepts into academic classrooms, he did not have time to think about the implications of YEDPA. However, the initial YETP plan was written primarily by the career education office.

Ron: We are solving it by starting to identify LEA persons who know something about CETA; they can then become resource persons for relating all existing LEA programs to a new CETA effort, such as YETP. Those resource persons ought to know enough about all the LEA programs so they will know how to link various LEA programs to various kinds of CETA programs.

Howard: We need workshops to train LEA persons to learn about all of CETA -- and some workshops for CETA persons to know about all LEA programs.

Barbara: We could think about devising joint workshops for CETA and LEA persons organized around functions rather than programs. For example, we could have workshops on topics such as: (1) field trips, (2) work experience, (3) shadowing, (4) career resource centers, and (5) internships.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 124
Career Employment Experiences, But Not Transition Services
April 5 and 6, 1979

Participants

Mr. George Degenhart
Project Director, Career Education
Springfield City Schools
Springfield, Ohio

Mr. Keith Ratliff
Clark County CETA Youth Administrator
Employment and Training Office
Springfield, Ohio

Mr. Frank S. Parsons, III
Director - YETP
Hinds-Rankin Consortium
Jackson Public Schools
Jackson, Mississippi

Ms. Wilma Jackson
Job Development Coordinator - YETP
Jackson Municipal Separate Schools - Davis School
Jackson, Mississippi

Mr. William E. Studyvin
Supervisor, Practical Arts and Vocational Education
Shawnee Mission, Kansas

Mr. G. R. (Bob) Gross
CETA Program Manager
Jackson/Leavenworth County Consortium
Olathe, Kansas

Mr. Edward Virant
Project Director - YETP
Grand Island Public Schools
Grand Island, Nebraska

Ms. Barbara M. Branigan
Manpower Specialist I/ Classroom Training and YETP Coordinator
CETA Regional Office
Grand Island, Nebraska

Mr. Wade M. Morrison
Director, CETA Skills Program
Arlington Public Schools
Arlington, Virginia

Observer

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to settle Fiscal Year differences between LEAs and the Department of Labor.
2. How to overcome bias against past Federal youth programs that act as deterrents to YETP.
3. How to help the Prime Sponsor better understand education and vice versa.
4. How to best publicize YETP as a long-run developmental effort rather than as a remedial effort.
5. How to solve administrative overhead problems of LEAs in operating a YETP effort.
6. How to develop self-esteem within YETP enrollees.
7. How to link YETP with LEA efforts to give youth general employability skills.
8. How to help YETP youth see themselves as "learners" rather than just "earners."
9. How to overcome semantic differences between LEAs and Prime Sponsors.
10. How to learn how to make an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement something new and different from past LEA/Prime Sponsor contractual agreements.
11. How to make YETP into a full individual development effort -- i.e., more than just a job.
12. How to solve personnel turnover problems in Prime Sponsor operations that result from political realities.
13. How to make Prime Sponsor goals and LEA goals for YETP youth more compatible.
14. How to solve the challenge of placing 16-17 year olds in unsubsidized employment in the private sector.
15. How to make YETP on-the-job training rules and regulations fit the total YETP effort.
16. How to make YETP work in small rural school districts outside the jurisdiction of the LEA which has signed the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

17. How to get clear answers about YETP to the local Prime Sponsor.

18. How to better link YETP with adult CETA services.

19. How to get funds required for planning, initiating, and trying out new and innovative YETP efforts.

20. How to get greater stability in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

21. How to get the same kind of Federal/state/local communication links for LEAs that now exist for Prime Sponsors.

22. How to get the funding basis for YETP tied to youth unemployment rates rather than adult unemployment rates.

23. How to avoid the problem of using PSE opportunities for disadvantaged versus private sector for advantaged youth.

24. How to revise YEDPA in ways that make it a more true partnership rather than primarily a Department of Labor effort.

25. How to tie VEP and YETP together as a whole for getting more private sector involvement.

26. How to help educators learn how to use CETA persons as resource consultants.

27. How to help school counselors become more knowledgeable and sympathetic to using CETA as a resource.

28. How to put measurable objectives into an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

29. How to make costs of LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements more nearly equal in cost effectiveness when contracted with CBOs.

30. How to help CBOs better understand the concept of the need for LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

31. How to get a better public relations effort for CETA.

32. How to get LEAs to be more flexible in using CETA as part of a total school effort rather than just another categorical "add-on."

33. How to get LEAs to read and understand the YETP rules and regulations.

34. How to convince LEAs to provide equity rather than just equality for economically disadvantaged youth.

35. How to demonstrate to LEAs that YETP can benefit all youth while paying special attention to the disadvantaged.

36. How to get to and work with top LEA decision-makers in working out LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

37. How to solve the Department of Labor syndrome of being silent too long and demanding a report too quickly.

38. How to help educators understand the need for community involvement in helping all youth solve problems of education/work relationships.

39. How to solve the academic credit problem for YETP without using salaries/allowances as an excuse for not doing so.

40. How to use YETP to help youth develop a better total lifestyle with community help.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Bill Studyvin and G.R. (Bob) Gross - Shawnee Mission, Kansas

Bill (LEA representative)

We developed a "career development center" in Shawnee Mission a few years ago. Its objective was to develop *career-oriented youth*. We try here to take occupational and self information to help youth develop a choice of a career cluster. We have our curriculum organized around these career clusters.

Jobs are approached by recognizing the "data/people/things" concept; a kid takes 10 days to go through the center.

When we started our first career center, the community was interested in having us open up four more the next year. We used vocational education funds to start the center; while it helped us identify potential vocational education students, it was for *all* kids.

Activities of the career center involve both the use of resource persons from the community *and* field trips to the community. For example, we had an artist from Hallmark Cards who agreed to critique student paintings.

The "career center" is built around the "career exploration" concept; the right to change is held sacred. As of now, the career center has become our school placement center.

We became involved with YETP as a means of setting up more career centers and having people operate them.

We have at the career center a 10-hour program with definite goals and objectives. After six years, we know that kids who go into health exploration are enrolling in courses like biology and chemistry because people in the career center told them to -- *not* because school people said so. We have had 7,500 hours of shadowing in hospitals in the last three years. Shadowing is very helpful in helping kids make and implement career decisions.

This summer, in SPEDY, we will work with 14-21 year olds for a special seven-and-a-half hour career orientation on work attitudes and interests. We would like to do this on an adult level; it would be easier and even more valuable.

Now we are working on a social studies presentation to ninth graders, orienting them to the idea of the career center.

Bob (Prime Sponsor representative)

These five career development centers have a full-time person. Each tenth grader participates 10 hours in this center. Last year we put centers in three other schools with YETP money. This year, we are putting them into seven more schools. The three that started last year are in Phase II, which has special training for eleventh and twelfth graders. This is part of the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

We put $1,200 worth of equipment and materials into each center plus 30 hours of income for the career education coordinator in each school ($9.00 per hour) plus travel.

Questions and Answers

Q - Could you tell us how you developed the good work sites?
A - You have to analyze the power structure of your community. The community can help you do it. Once you get in the door, you have to produce. For example, we buy uniforms for these kids -- they look good -- and that helps them do good work.

Q - Can you pay for uniforms out of YETP funds?
A - No, except for CETA participants. We have 100 YETP-eligible students required as a minimum.

Q - What distinguishes the CETA client from students in any other school program?
A - Nothing. BUT, in our summer SPEDY program, we have got to put participants through the career center again.

Q - How did your fellow educators see you after you got involved with CETA?
A - (Bill) Nothing negative. I have been there too long.

Q - Are you getting more than 22 percent of YETP funds in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement?
A - No, 22 percent only. We are using all the funds for these career centers, including consultation money for the summer. The staff salaries for the coordinators are paid by LEA funds.

Q - Would you describe the "career development center" as a "career employment experience" or a "transition service"?
A - "Career employment experience."

George Degenhart and Keith Ratliff - Springfield, Ohio

Keith (LEA representative)

Our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement is a full-fledged legal contract. This contract was put together by the county prosecutor -- in part, to protect against embezzlement. It spells out specifically what both the LEA and the Prime Sponsor will do. Services received focus on career education.

Why did we go to the Springfield LEA? Because it had a good career education plan.

In our 22 percent agreement, we get: (a) Two hours per week of class instruction for YETP enrollees; (b) Computer assisted career guidance; (c) Tie in with SPEDY -- the LEA operates a pre-vocational career exploration lab in the summer.

We set forth our objectives in legal terms: (a) objectives; (b) tasks to be performed; and (c) how success is to be measured.

In our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement, the LEA pays no wages; the Urban League does that. LEA gets money only for staff salaries and transportation. The relationship between LEA and CETA has to be present.

George (Prime Sponsor representative)

The LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement is successful only if both parties work hard.

The unique components of our program are in providing academic credit and in trying to blend the YETP effort into our total career education program by recognizing the special needs of YETP enrollees through an intensive assessment of these students. YETP enrollees are helped to open doors to work experience and possible employment in the private sector, which provide contacts that economically disadvantaged kids do not usually have.

Spin-offs from the YETP program include (a) better communication with other LEAs, and (b) better communication among the 17 youth-serving agencies in our community (where we planned a Youth Work proposal).

Ohio Career Guidance Information System is a computer-based occupational-information system, for which we use YETP funds.

We are trying to build a data system that begins at any point at which youth enter the program; the system may follow them through for as long as three years.

Questions and Answers

Q - What do you give academic credit for?
A - For the two hours of class per week and for the vocational work experience.

Q - Do you have any kids getting career education but no work experience?

A - No. All 130 get both, but the work experience is provided by the CBO.

Q - Can a YETP enrollee get academic credit just for work experience?

A - No, he gets a half unit only if he both attends the career education classes two hours per week and works six hours per week in work experience at $2.90 per hour.

Q - How can you provide academic credit for paid classwork?

A - It is legal, so we do it.

Q - What kinds of things are your YETP funds being used for in the LEA?

A - We are paying for the salary of a career education coordinator, a teacher of the career education class, and the computer service (GIS).

Q - How do the 130 YETP enrollees get together from the 11 high schools to get the career education training?

A - They all come to the Urban League Center to attend the career education classes.

Wade Morrison - Arlington, Virginia

Wade (LEA representative)

We have a "career center" in our county -- a vocational-technical center serving kids from all high schools in the county. It includes career exploration for ninth graders and our CETA Skills Center.

Our Prime Sponsor puts out an RFP to all interested parties. We submitted one last year, as did some CBOs. The Prime Sponsor has had less than satisfactory results from the CBOs, so the Prime Sponsor contracted with our LEA to operate YETP. The LEA then works with CBOs as part of the contract for both YETP and YCCIP.

With respect to YETP, we planned for enrollees to spend 20 hours per week in our CETA Skills Center, with subcontracts to CBOs for outreach and client follow-up for two individuals.

YETP is built around the Adkins Life Skills Program, a videotaped approach with individualized instruction. We got the materials and used YETP funds to purchase the audiovisual materials (including a motion picture film camera) and to pay for an instructor. Materials are available four hours per day, from 1:00-5:00 p.m. No academic credit is given. While some of these youth are still enrolled in school, they come to our center after their regular classes are over.

The maximum class size is 15, with open entry/open exit. After finishing, youths could: (a) return to school; (b) go for the GED; (c) go into adult CETA vocational-skill training; (d) go into our OJT component, where we can subcontract with private employers for youth 18 or over; or (e) enter military service.

We have not worked out academic credit because we have not yet been able to tie in with the regular school curriculum.

From the Prime Sponsor's point of view, it contracts out the whole YETP with 92 to 95 percent of this to the LEA -- including payment of youth allowances.

Question and Answers

Q - Have you had trouble getting OJT as a viable YETP activity?
A - I have it in three different contracts: (a) Title I, (b) Governor's Training Program and (c) YETP. We cannot, however, use OJT for YETP enrollees under 18 years of age.

Q - Are you having any work experience component for regular YETP enrollees?
A - No, it is all transition services.

Q - How many YETP enrollees are in your program?
A - One hundred. About half are out-of-school youth.

Q - How are you hooking up with Arlington County's career education program?
A - Hardly at all. We are really operating outside the mainstream of the school system.

Barbara Branigan and Edward Virant - Grand Island, Nebraska

Ed (LEA representative)

Our program is more of a community project than a school project, even though the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement is with the Grand Island Public Schools.

We have concentrated mostly on meeting the needs of dropouts, not in-school youth. They are out of school, not living at home, and usually in trouble with the law. There are some in-school youth, 16-21 years old.

YETP is built on the concept of encouraging these youth to: (a) complete high school and (b) enter the labor force with good work attitudes.

YETP involves five staff members. All of the money comes from our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement, except for allowances to students attending technical schools.

We build individualized programs for each kid. We have no standard program.

We spent a lot of time building up referral services and now have contacts with every social service agency in town -- probation courts, job services, etc. Once we had referral agencies, we said we wanted kids to have some kind of success.

We do an assessment on every youth who walks in. We try very hard to build a relationship with each youth, including all our staff people (receptionists, secretaries, professional staff, etc.).

Phase I - We get kids into GED test-taking almost immediately. Ninety-six point three percent of our kids pass the GED. At the same time, we do vocational assessment including Nebraska Career Information System (or needle sort).

Phase II - We have a contract with our local technical school to provide vocational training. This comes after assessment. We can do OJT, but we do not do much of it.

Phase III - We set up work experience for each kid enrolled in vocational skill training.

Phase IV - We make placements into unsubsidized employment.

We have no trouble getting academic credit for the work experience, but since most of our kids are dropouts interested in GED, they do not want it.

Barbara (Prime Sponsor representative)

For in-school YETP-eligible youths, we have youth work experience, and OJT. The youth may then be transitioned into SPEDY in the summer.

In the past, the Prime Sponsor has trusted educators to really run the program, with monitoring done by the Prime Sponsor.

Questions and Answers

Q - What kinds of spin-off programs do you have?
A - We have started a parenting program which meets the needs of pregnant mother participants. We also find we can help kids in budgeting if they are getting kicked out of their apartment. We are also developing a job seeking/getting/holding class.

Q - Are some kids not getting served by Balance of State?
A - No. Services are available but not utilized very much.

Q - Did you decide to concentrate on out-of-school youth primarily because you had so few YETP-eligible youth in the regular school?
A - No, it was identified as a community need.

Q - How many YETP enrollees are you working with?
A - Sixty-two now. There have been 112 involved during the last 12 months.

Q - Do you have a Fiscal Year Contract?
A - Yes. The school district is supporting us with lots of in-kind services (including special education).

Q - What do you call this alternative school?
A - Progress School.

Q - If the YETP youth finishes only with GED, what else is available?
A - We can put them into other CETA programs.

Wilma Jackson and Frank Parsons - Jackson, Mississippi

Frank (LEA representative)

We work in a two-county consortium mandated to have strictly work experience -- not transition services. Anything in transition services had to be provided by the LEA itself last year. This year we can provide transition services meetings.

We cover six LEAs which signed the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement with Jackson Public Schools as the lead school district.

We will have served 200 YETP youths. We started with job seeking/getting/holding skills. In looking for job sites, we started by looking at each youth's tentative career choices and then we tried to find job sites to match these. Each YETP enrollee has a set of specific things he/she must do to remain in the program.

We now have more jobs developed than we can fill.

We have tried to look at where the jobs will be in Mississippi in the next 8 to 10 years and we try to encourage YETP youth to look at these. We cannot get transportation funds, so we try to place youth near their homes.

We tried to include handicapped students who are YETP-eligible also.

Youth evaluators are paid once a month; as a result, they had to learn how to budget themselves.

We try to help each YETP youth develop good work habits, work values, resumes, etc., as part of our transition service. Employers are being very supportive of what we are trying to do. Our YETP youth have helped make our program successful because they do have good work attitudes.

Last year, some employers were skeptical of the program because it was "CETA." This year, we have more employer slots than we have YETP enrollees.

We have worked very hard at making sure that every student has a meaningful job. As a result, of 94 enrollees last year, 90 percent were still in the program at the close of the project.

Now, more students want to enroll in YETP than we can take. We are trying to do more with career transition.

Wilma (Prime Sponsor representative)

We developed jobs by first apologizing for any past mistakes a previous CETA trainee may have made and by assuring employers we would pull the youth off if he/she did not work out. We now need approximately 150 more YETP youth to fill all the employer slots that have come up.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you pay kids for the pre-vocational experiences?
A - Yes. They are paid allowances for these first four to five hours.

Q - Why did your Prime Sponsor not allow you any transportation costs?
A - Just because it is "allowable" does not mean a Prime Sponsor has to do it.

Q - What grades are your YETP kids in?
A - Most are seniors but some are tenth graders. The age range is 16-21.

Q - Is your work experience going on during school hours or after school?
A - After school, except in a rare situation.

Q - Where do you do your orientation?
A - At our career center. We do some at the regular school during the school day.

Q - What are you doing about career assessment programs?
A - We were told the Prime Sponsor did not want to spend money on them.

Q - What kind of geographic territory do you serve?
A - A 60-mile radius with urban, suburban, rural mix.

TWO ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to best publicize YETP as a long-run developmental effort rather than as a remedial effort?
- How to use YETP to help youth develop a better total lifestyle with community help.

Issue: How to best publicize YETP as a long-run developmental effort rather than as a remedial effort

Frank: When we started working with the Prime Sponsor, we were told that the goals were: (a) to put money in the kids' pockets and (b) to find jobs for youth. We thought it should be longer range developmental goals. It is tough, because some educators had negative thoughts of CETA as just a welfare system. We were and are determined to show that the YETP is more than that.

Wade: One of the things that bastardized CETA was Title VI (1976) which was simply intended to put money on the street. This reinforced the income transfer image of CETA, for it just employed PSE.

Keith: To put it into perspective, we had a $6 million total budget including (a) $3/4 million for youth (b) $1.5 million for Title II-B, and (c) $4 million for PSE Title VI.

Bob: Labor sometimes takes the adversary role as though it is something we cooked up. Now PSE has been changed so that the ceiling is $7,200, which is too low to make many agencies happy. In addition, it is limited to 18 months with a job development component all the way through, even though the time lines are unclear.

Keith: The new Title II-D allows adult training programs to take some of this money for training purposes rather than PSE. It is really Title II-D funds to be used for Title VI eligible persons who are also eligible for II-D. Simply put, Title II-D is training. In our Prime Sponsor, we are earmarking these funds first to retrain adults whose CETA PSE-eligibility has run out.

Wilma: We need to erase the attitude "here is a job on a platter; do as little as possible until it is over and then forget it." Instead, we want to equip these kids to learn how to seek employment and to find jobs, to develop the total person, to learn that there is honor in work. We want the participant to see this program as a means to an end, as a stepping stone. The Prime Sponsor uses the word "employment" as the goal. The youth should think of YETP as equipping them with skills that will help them control their own destiny rather than remain "welfare persons" whom society will take care of for the rest of their life. We can sell this to economically disadvantaged kids if we really help the youth acquire career decision-making skills, if we emphasize career exploration opportunities, and if we emphasize the dignity of all work. We want to get away from labeling some jobs as honorable and some others as no good.

Keith: As a Prime Sponsor we have to fill out a YPPS (Youth Program Planning Summary). It has columns for all sorts of things including "obtaining employment." You can have "direct placement" or "indirect placement." Congress wants to see numbers in that column. We have to show numbers in this "employment" column. There is not any column for "employability," in spite of the fact that the first sentence of YEDPA talks about "future employability."

Wilma: YETP kids need to learn these employability skills. This is not being done now through the school system.

Keith: Employability is a lofty goal, but the bottom line for the Department of Labor is employment, not employability.

Wade: The only quantifiable skills we can measure are numbers. You can not measure employability skills. I can get numbers for employability, but there is no room for this on the YPPS form I have to fill out.

Wilma: Then we have to re-evaluate the total educational process so that goals can be stated more in terms of developmental employability skills.

Keith: The problem is with the Department of Labor, according to Dr. Ripley's study, not with the local Prime Sponsor. The most knowledgeable people are at the local level, the next most knowledgable are at the regional level, and the least knowledgeable are at the Federal level. At the Federal level, they know the least of all.

George: Youth programs have not really been looked at yet.

Bill: We have said that both LEAs and the Prime Sponsor are negative towards YETP. We have also said that youth are negative. We have got to overcome this by doing something dramatic. The best thing to do is to give a youth a job with money, and then go on to develop employability skills. It is a matter of first things first.

Wilma: We have to develop a trusting relationship with the youth after we provide a job.

Bob: We are pointing up the importance of the work site supervisor, who is the real counselor of the youth. We need to train the work site supervisor to have the same kinds of positive attitudes towards the employability skill goals as those of us in YETP have. Sometimes the work site supervisor is assigned to this task; he/she did not ask for it and does not understand it.

Wilma: Then we have got to move that youth to another work site supervisor. There are plenty of work site supervisors to do the job.

Keith: In NYC the concept focused on work experience. YETP is different in that, in addition to work experience, we have developed a career education emphasis on employability skill.

Barbara: I do not think the Department of Labor is discouraging the employability goals. The problem comes from the fact that we cannot measure them as well as we can measure employment. We cannot quickly change society's attitudes towards YETP. We are talking about changing the goals of YETP to put a bigger emphasis on employability than on employment. We need to give the Department of Labor specifics in measuring employability.

Wade: The "buck stops" with the Congress. It is going to have to recognize the validity of employability skills.

Ed: Giving recognition to the youth is the key. We do not like to compartmentalize into things like "jobs." I am turning out kids in unsubsidized employment, but we are doing it by talking about the total person; your goal is not the job but rather "what do you want to do with your life?" All the time I am getting indirect placements (kids getting their own jobs in the private sector), but that is not the way I talk to the kid. The fact that I know employment is important to the Department of Labor does not mean that I have to communicate this to the youth. We want the youth to feel that they did it on their own.

Keith: How can you match your goals with those of the Department of Labor? Most LEAs do not even know what "indirect placement" is. Our contractors do not understand the categories that the Prime Sponsors have to use in reporting to the Department of Labor. MAYBE THIS SHOULD BE A TOPIC FOR THE SUMMER WORKSHOPS.

George: Those Department of Labor forms do not fit well at all with goals of youth. For example, we work up plans individually with each youth. This series of beginning tasks does not appear in the Department of Labor evaluation forms.

Wilma: The work site agreement form that we use lists responsibilities of (a) the youth, (b) the counselor, and (c) the work site supervisors.

George: Organized labor has to come in. We are promoting the professions too much and, as a result, teaching negative attitudes towards traditional "blue collar" work.

Issue: How to use YETP to help youth develop a better total lifestyle with community help

Bill: YETP youth have spent 15 years developing negative attitudes and lack of hope for the future. It is going to take a total community effort to get this done. None of these Prime Sponsors and LEAs can do it all themselves or even just by joining forces. The broader community must become involved.

Bob: You have to have a coordinator. Some community group has to take the initiative.

Keith: We use the Prime Sponsor as the coordinating agency for everything dealing with employment -- for example, Joint Vocational School (training), OIC, and Clark Technical College. We are measured by how we perform as a group, not by the individual CBOs. We are stressing cooperation and coordination among all agencies. We think of ourselves as a "CETA family" for employment.

Bob: Do you have a newsletter to circulate among them?

Keith: Yes.

Frank: Our LEA YETP coordinators are working with work site supervisors. Our rationale for having the LEA as the coordination agency is that *we* have the kids and the community backing.

Keith: DISAGREE. We, the Prime Sponsor, have the *resources* and that is what is important.

Ed: In Grand Island, we, *the LEA*, serve as the coordinating agency. We think of CETA as only one of the community resources available to help our kids.

Keith: We, the Prime Sponsor, think of the LEA as one among several CBOs, in effect, in our community.

Wilma: It is a vicious circle. If you put the Prime Sponsor at the top and LEA at the bottom, you just wind up with a circle and go around and around. At every community resource we went to, the first question was, "Is this part of CETA?" When we said "It is part of our LEA effort," they readily cooperated.

George: From the LEA standpoint, we try to encourage use of *all* community resources for all students, with YETP being used for *some* students.

Keith: As a Prime Sponsor type, I am *not* a social worker but an administrator. We see ourselves as coordinators, but not as a service agency to youth.

Ed: If we are going to draw a diagram, we should put the *youth* at the *center* or *hub* of the diagram, not the Prime Sponsor or the LEA. Even in a community as small as Grand Island, we have many agencies that do not deal with each other. The other day, I sat in on a meeting on child abuse where all segments of the community were blaming each other.

George: Organizationally, the *center* is where you have the greatest clout on the student -- and *that is* WORK EXPERIENCE. We would do better to build from here -- not a particular setting, but rather a *function* called work experience.

Bob: *Somebody* is going to have to take responsibility for writing to every community group.

Bill: The most logical one to do this is the Prime Sponsor.

Wade: The manpower planning council should be the coordinating body, with appropriate representation from all these community groups.

George: The manpower planning council would not be appropriate for our LEA because the Council is not concerned with all kids.

Wilma: The school board is the hub of most communities. When LEAs are talking, they know they have community credibility. On the other hand, many CBOs act like big wheels and they turn off the community. When the board of education puts its "seal of approval" on YETP, it will make a big difference.

Bob: There are lots of substantial organizations. We are going to have to have them sit down together and talk about policy -- some goals on which they can all agree. It could be called by any agency with great credibility, not by CETA.

Keith: DISAGREE. The Red Cross in our community has great credibility, but it would be entirely inappropriate for the agency to call this coordinated work/education effort. An agency needs not only credibility, but also expertise in work/education relationships.

Wilma: Does it really make any difference who calls the meeting? If the one who calls it has the right personality, his knowledge of work/education does not matter.

Keith: The Prime Sponsor must be involved.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 125
Participation of 14 and 15 Year Olds
April 12 and 13, 1979

Participants

Dr. Jerry C. Stone
Superintendent
Iuka Special School District
Iuka, Mississippi

Ms. Linda S. Harvey
Assistant Director
Youth Program Monitoring
Governor's Office of Job
Development and Training
Jackson, Mississippi

Mr. Edward Killeen
Career Education Coordinator
Patrick Gavin Middle School
South Boston, Massachusetts

Mr. Tim Reagan
Deputy Director of Employment
and Training
Employment and Economic
Policy Administration (CETA)
Boston, Massachusetts

Ms. Audrey Lehman
Business and Education Coordinator
Madison Metropolitan School
District
Madison, Wisconsin

Mr. James Schommer
Director
YMCA-CETA Youth Committee
Madison, Wisconsin

Dr. Forestine L. London
Supervisor
Vocational-Technical Education
and Guidance
Shelby County School System
Memphis, Tennessee

Ms. Peggy R. Glass
Contract Specialist
Employment and Training
Administration (CETA)
Memphis, Tennessee

Ms. Sandy Westby
Project Coordinator-YETP
West Fargo High School
West Fargo, Norgh Dakota

Observers

Mr. Sherman Olson
Manager
Employment Training Program
Memphis, Tennessee

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief State
School Officers
Washington D.C.

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to help educators become more aware and informed of the demands of the world of work.

2. How to use YETP to help rural youth better incorporate the work values of industrial society and to become more aware of the nature of that society.

3. How to make a mutual planning process work in forming LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

4. How to help educators and Prime Sponsors better understand each other's "bureacracy."

5. How to get more uniformity in interpretation of YETP rules and regulations.

6. How to improve the quality of reporting services in YETP so as to better meet the needs of both the Prime Sponsor and the LEA.

7. How to avoid conflicts between LEAs and Prime Sponsors when monitoring tasks are undertaken.

8. How to avoid political overtones of YETP implementation.

9. How to make monitoring more of a preventive/developmental effort rather than a remedial/corrective effort.

10. How to conduct a YETP effort for 14-15 year olds in ways that will be of maximum benefit to them (considering later possible ineligibility).

11. How to solve the insurance problems and work site limitation problems for 14-15 year olds in YETP.

12. How to get clarification of YETP rules and regulations for LEAs.

13. What do educators need to know about CETA?

14. What do Prime Sponsors need to know about the teaching/learning process.

15. How can LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements be made that go beyond YETP into more general LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships?

16. How to get better working relationships between CBOs and LEAs.

17. What other Federal Education funds are available for use in linking with YETP funds to provide programs of help to youth?

18. How to better involve the private sector, and the upcoming Private Industry Councils (PICs), in YETP and in links with Prime Sponsors and with LEAs.

19. How to find work site placements for YETP youth that will be of significant career interest to them.

20. How can YETP efforts for 14-15 year olds lead to more appropriate high school opportunities (when not all curricula are readily available to them)?

21. How to incorporate alternative schools with regular LEAs in a total YETP effort.

22. How to best use the expertise unique to each segment of the community in a YETP effort rather than having any one part pretending to have expertise which, in fact, is more readily available in some other part of the community.

23. How to build a commitment to YETP youth on the part of both Prime Sponsors and LEAs.

24. How to provide a continuum of services for students (starting prior to age 14) that will lead to good work habits and to actual employment later.

25. How to get better planning cycles between CETA and LEAs so that joint planning can take place.

26. How to get reporting systems better coordinated with implementation efforts so that the true effects of the effort can be reported.

27. What are the learner outcomes for YETP? -- i.e., how should youth be different after completing a full YETP program?

28. How to handle problems that arise from frequent changes in YETP rules and regulations.

29. How to better involve the private sector in planning and operating YETP efforts.

30. How can CETA personnel be made more knowledgeable about the private sector?

31. How to develop better work attitudes and positive motivation for YETP youth.

32. How to develop more patience and understanding on the part of work sites and work site supervisors so that they do not give up too soon on a YETP enrollee.

33. How to merge CETA and LEA expertise in ways that will result in better communication.

34. How to find adequate time for YETP during the school year (not just in the summer).

35. How to involve regular academic teachers and vocational teachers in the total YETP effort.

36. How to organize and conduct orientation sessions jointly for Prime Sponsor and LEA personnel prior to engaging in a YETP effort.

37. How do we overcome the general negative community attitudes toward CETA that prevents some LEAs from wanting to work with Prime Sponsors?

38. How to overcome bureaucracy barriers so that YETP implementation efforts can come closer to covering the whole year for which they are funded, instead of only part of a year because of the necessity for spending so much time in "start up" details.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Peggy Glass and Forestine London - Memphis, Tennessee

Peggy (Prime Sponsor representative)

Youth programs are a priority of our Prime Sponsor. Our YETP in-school program is much better this year than it was last year. We learned much last year that is now helping us do a better job. If YETP continues to get Federal funds, local efforts like ours will get better and better as time goes on.

The basic concept around which our in-school YETP program operates is based on vocational training coupled with work experience. We are trying very hard to develop linkages between our LEA and our CBOs aimed at increasing the quality of our total services to youth, including YETP.

Forestine (LEA representative)

Our project is called Project EDDY (Employment Designed for Disadvantaged Youth). We have 125 YETP enrollees -- 70 percent male and 30 percent female. Of the total, 20 percent are persons with handicaps.

Our total EDDY program can be thought of as consisting of two major phases:

> Phase 1 - Basic job readiness skills provided through 40 hours of classroom instruction. This Phase is currently operating in five high schools and in a vocational school for handicapped students. There are 18-25 participants in each school, with one YETP teacher paid for by YETP funds in each of these six settings.
>
> Phase 2 - Career employment experience (sometimes called OJT by Prime Sponsors). We now have 12 occupational areas in which we provide training for YETP enrollees. We anticipate adding new areas in the future. In addition to involving YETP-paid teachers, a strong effort is made to involve our regular academic teachers and vocational education teachers in the YETP effort. For example, librarians have been given a set of the special YETP materials on careers that we developed.

We have a strong emphasis on guidance/counseling which is done both individually and in groups with YETP enrollees. Of the six YETP supervisors, three are counselors well equipped to provide this type of service.

Two years ago, I chaired the Shelby County Curriculum Development Committee, composed of secondary counselors, which developed an excellent set of career education activity packages for our use. These too, are used in our YETP program. Many of these take only five minutes for enrollees to complete and can be used at any time.

Using YETP funds, we have purchased various kinds of materials for use by our YETP enrollees including a book entitled "How to Write Better Resumes" (used in Phase 1) and another book entitled "Entering the World of Work" (used in Phase 2).

Questions and Answers

Q - Who publishes the "Entering the World of Work" book that you use?
A - McKnight Publishers.

Q - What, specifically, are you doing with 14-15 year olds?
A - We do the job readiness part of YETP, i.e., Phase 1. Phase 1 is a prerequisite to Phase 2 (career employment experience). All YETP enrollees going into Phase 2 must have met the job readiness standards associated with Phase 1 -- even if that means they are older than the 14-15 year olds we are talking about here.

Q - Give us an example of what you mean when you say you couple Program Goals with "Performance Standards."
A - Example of a Program Goal: Each student will receive a minimum of 45 hours of job readiness training.
Example of a Performance Standard for that program goal: After 40 hours of job readiness training, 90 percent of YETP enrollees will be able to fill out job resumes; 75 percent will be able to successfully engage in a job interview; etc.

Q - What percent of your YETP time is spent on participant motivation activities?
A - It varies from school to school. On the average, it may be around 50 percent.

Q - Are you asking your regular teachers to also use the career education materials you described, or are these used only by your special YETP supervisors in each building?
A - ALL teachers are asked to use these career education materials. In addition to these, YETP supervisors are given the kinds of special materials purchased specifically for use by YETP enrollees.

Q - Are the six YETP specialists, one in each school, paid out of YETP funds?
A - Yes.

Audrey Lehman and Jim Schommer - Madison, Wisconsin

Audrey (LEA representative)

In Madison, our LEA does the "transition services" part of YETP, while one of the CBOs does the "work experience" part (involving paid jobs). When we started, YETP rules and reglations were stated in such a way that we could serve all high school youth with "transition services," not just the economically disadvantaged. We never did try to do "transition services" for ALL, but instead devised a special "transition services" effort for high-risk potential dropouts, many of whom were economically disadvantaged but some of whom were not.

There are four phases in our YETP program: (1) career exploration; (2) career observation, with a mimimum of three jobs to be covered; (3) vocational training either in the LEA or in the community; (4) placement and employment.

If a particular youth is YETP-eligible, she/he is employed for work experience purposes by our CBO during Phases 1 and 2. When these youth reach Phase 3, we try to move them out of the CBO's subsidized work experience program and put them in one of our regular cooperative education programs (thus saving the CBO work experience slots primarily for use by 14-15 year olds in Phases 1 or 2). Thus, you can think of Phases 1 and 2 as being primarily (but not exclusively) for 14-15 year olds, while Phases 3 and 4 are for 16-18 year olds.

We have a career resource center available for use in our YETP program. We have from two to four teachers employed, at any given time, in our YETP program. These teachers teach the Phase 1 career exploration course (9 weeks); work with students in Phase 2 on their job observation activities; and in Phase 3 help these students get into a suitable cooperative education program or some other type of job training.

Another way of looking at these phases is as follows: Phase 1 -- Really a career awareness effort coupled with attempts to build positive self concepts and positive work attitudes. Phase 2 -- Youth are to observe four occupations, including one in a "non-traditional" occupation. The student is to develop, in coordination with school staff, parents, and work site supervisors, a career plan which follows the youth through the entire YETP program. The career plan is constantly modified as students progress through the program. Phase 3 -- This is employment skills training experience. We try to make sure that the student's academic program is definitely related to his/her activities. The major point is that it is a planned, sequential program extending over a major period of time, not just a "one shot" effort.

Questions and Answers

Q - How do you measure success in improving the YETP enrollee's "self image"?

A - There are not any good tests available yet. We do this primarily through observing and interviewing students.

Q - What percent of your time is spent in motivational activities with students?
A - It depends on the student -- from 25 to 100 percent of the time.

Q - How many YETP youth do you serve at any one time?
A - In Phase 1, about 40; in Phase 2, from 10 to 20; and in Phase 3, about five. We try to get as many of the 16-17 year olds as possible out of the formal YETP program in Phase 3 (even though Phase 3 is viewed conceptually as part of our total "youth employment" effort), BUT we still do have some 16-17 year old youth just entering Phase 1.

Q - What would happen if you were to use private industry as work sites for youth YETP enrollees?
A - We do use the private sector for our 16-17 year olds in our cooperative program, but you cannot say they are officially in "YETP" when they get into Phase 3.

Q - Do you have a "pre-Phase 1" effort for youth under Age 14?
A - Yes. We have a strong K-12 career education effort, and this is what we use prior to the time the youth reaches age 14. Our Prime Sponsor does not pay much attention to this part. However, statewide, it is getting more attention now from CETA, as illustrated in a recent CETA Balance of State meeting I attended.

Tim Reagan and Ed Killeen - Boston, Massachusetts

Tim (Prime Sponsor respresenatative)

Prior to YETP, we (CETA) had very little contact with the Boston School Department. Since YEDPA came into existence, we have developed much better LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships. Because we have a big Tier I YIEP effort operating in some sections of the Boston School District, we tried to develop YETP in those parts of the LEA where the Tier I YIEP effort did not exist. It was only after we obtained an official LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement under YETP that it became possible for us to begin working with 14-15 year old youth.

The agreement itself came about smoothly primarily because of good working relationships between top persons in the LEA and top persons in the Prime Sponsor's shop. We do have some CBOs working with our LEA in an effort to make our LEA Prime Sponsor agreement more cost effective. By doing so, we find we are able to put more of our YETP funds into youth wages. This, after all, is the goal. We are still doing YETP evaluations using a CETA perspective. This simply is not satisfactory. The regular CETA monitoring system is NOT adequate for measuring the effectiveness of YETP.

Q - Are you talking about "monitoring" or "evaluation" when you say this?
A - Evaluation.

There is a need to look seriously at the question: What is the best community resource for use in meeting the "youth employment needs" of 14-15 year olds? It may well be that the answer is not CETA.

Ed (LEA representative)

In addition to making sure that all our YETP enrollees were income-eligible, we added selection criteria that called for paying attention to "special needs" students and to "high risk potential dropouts."

This summer, we will combine our YETP effort with SPEDY. This will let us serve 150 youth this summer (double last year's 75 youth).

We are interested, in our YETP program, in serving teachers as well as students. Our vocational education teachers, initially, had real problems handling the special needs (handicapped) youth we sent them in YETP. This year, we are mainstreaming these special needs students in with regular vocational education students.

In my particular school (which is an alternative school in the Boston school system) we operate a comprehensive career education program, of which YETP is regarded as one of the important components. We have a "career education coordinator" (like myself) in each of our schools, plus a career resource center in each school. In addition, school volunteers are deeply involved in our total career education effort. We saw a need for a "work experience component" that we had previously been unable to meet through our existing career education effort. It is in meeting this need that YETP has been able to serve as a valuable addition to our career education effort. Further, YETP has allowed us to increase both the quantity and the quality of counseling and guidance services to YETP youth. It is in the area of counseling and guidance that some of our CBOs are providing good help to us.

Questions and Answers

Q - Are your YETP enrollees all potential dropouts?
A - Yes. Some of them are real dropouts. There are a few that would not be classified as "high risk potential dropouts," but most of them would be.

Q - In your summer career employment experience program, through which you are mainstreaming "special needs" students with regular non-handicapped youth, do you team teach using vocational education teachers with special education teachers?

A - No. We use just vocational education teachers. Since they had these YETP "special needs" youth last year, they are now more ready and able to work with them.

Q - Is your YETP effort limited to 14-15 year olds?

A - Yes. This is necessary because we have a YIEP program for 16-19 year olds.

Q - How successful are you in your attempt to get every teacher involved in your career education effort?

A - It does not "take" with all of them; some need a lot of support services.

Sandy Westby - West Fargo, North Dakota

Sandy (LEA representative)

There is only one CETA Prime Sponsor for the entire State of North Dakota.

Last summer, we had a YETP program consisting of four days of work experience plus five hours of classwork each Friday.

There are three major components in our YETP program: (a) In-school program--15 slots (7 of these are 14-15 year olds); (b) Out-of-school program--8 slots; and (c) Faculty inservice education program. To adequately understand our YETP effort, you have to understand that we are trying to link it with a current Title IV-C Elementary and Secondary Education Act program. This Title IV-C program is an "advisor-advisee" program involving about 40 staff at the middle school level, about 60 staff persons at the senior high level (we call this our "Key program"), plus a "lighthouse" program for older youth. I am responsible for both programs. They are tied together in many ways. The "advisor-advisee" program has each teacher responsible for advising relatively few students.

One of our teacher inservice education activities this year involved asking teachers to go out in the business/industry community for 1/2 day to observe the "real world of work." Each teacher was asked to bring back a career resource person from the site visited. We used these career resource persons to put on a "career day" for our students one morning. (While the regular teachers were gone, we hired substitute teachers to take their place.) Of 60 teachers involved, 44 were successful in bringing a career resource person back with them. This program was evaluated very positively by both the teachers and the students.

I currently meet each YETP enrollee about four hours per month to do things like interpersonal skill development. This summer, I will meet with students five hours per week, when we will do things such as taking them on tours of business/industry, having career resource speakers in, etc. In addition, I will be doing two weeks of inservice education for our teachers. I am also involved in curriculum writing for our "Key program" and for our "advisor-advisee" program.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you use YETP money to pay for teacher inservice?

A - Yes. We had $2,400 in YETP funds specifically set aside for teacher inservice. We use our Title IV-C funds for our "advisor-advisee" program (which we conceptualize as part of our total YETP effort), so we could afford to do this.

Q - What are you doing with your 14-15 year old YETP enrollees that is different from what your are doing with your 16-17 year old YETP enrollees?

A - There is not much difference at the present time. With only 15 YETP enrollees and, having about half time to devote to them, I am pretty much able to do it on an individualized instruction basis. Each YETP enrollee gets, in effect, a "custom-made" YETP experience.

Q - Do you provide a GED program for your out-of-school YETP enrollees?

A - Yes. They get paid while doing this as well as when they are working.

Jerry Stone and Linda Harvey - Jackson, Mississippi

Linda (Prime Sponsor representative)

As a Balance of State operation, 60 of our 79 counties are in YETP with two major components: (a) career employment experiences and (b) transition services. Our 14-15 year olds participate in "transition services" only. Each of our YETP enrollees must have an employability plan. This year we have increased the number of "career labs" paid for by YETP funds in various counties and around the State.

Jerry (LEA representative)

Anything we set up in our school system must: (a) meet student needs and (b) be there when the student wants it. Our "career learning laboratory" operates on an open basis. It is voluntary for any student who wants to use it; no student is forced to use it. We have some 13 year olds who use it, but other kids never go near it during their entire high school experience.

We have a strong K-12 career education program. Our K-12 career education effort operates through infusion in all courses, not through an "add on" approach using a separate course called "career education." As we re-do curriculum materials, we are now making a conscious effort to put a career education emphasis into each curriculum revision. Our teacher career education inservice effort is very helpful to our entire YETP program, BUT no YETP funds are used for this. We find some YETP enrollees who seem never to get beyond the point of seeing YETP as simply "subsidized employment"; others do much better.

We try very hard to make our YETP program available to those youth who need it the most -- i.e., the ones who are most difficult to help. This, of course, means that we made it much harder for us to meet the Department of Labor criteria of "success." That is, if we had as our primary concern meeting those Department of Labor criteria, we would be "creaming" among our 18 year olds ready now for employment rather than focusing in, as we do, on "tough to reach" 14-15 year olds.

We organize our YETP program around a goal of helping each YETP enrollee make a career choice and then decide, for herself/himself, what she/he needs to do in order to implement that choice. We concentrate on helping the youth to take responsibility for herself/himself. More and more, we meet resistance and obstacles that make it tough to find employment for youth less than 18 years of age. This becomes especially hard for 14-15 year old YETP youth.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you see a pattern in your area of declining jobs and declining population?
A - No, our situation is the reverse; both jobs and population are increasing.

Q - How does the Iuka, Mississippi, school district meet the reporting and evaluation requirements of YETP?
A - We follow all requirements from the Prime Sponsor.

Q - Is the person assigned to work with identified YETP enrollees paid for by CETA?
A - Yes.

Q - How is your career laboratory staffed?
A - By a secretary paid for with YETP funds. Other youth are not supposed to use it.

Q - Are career laboratories in Mississippi all paid for by YETP funds?

A - No. BUT we (the CETA Prime Sponsor) are moving in the direction of supporting more career laboratories.

Q - Could you write YETP youth transportation costs into your YETP program?

A - Yes, but we prefer to use our YETP funds primarily for youth wages. These economically disadvantaged youth are very ingenious in figuring out their own transportation problems, provided they know they are going to get some money in their pocket. We do let them ride our school buses during the school year and might consider using those school buses for YETP youth during the summer as well. It would not cost much more than to let the school buses simply sit unused.

Q - How are you able not to segregate YETP enrollees from other youth in your LEA?

A - We ask all our students to fill out all forms including those for YETP eligibility, food stamp eligibility, etc. As a result, it is hard for anyone to know who is a formal "participant" in any program.

Q - What is in your career laboratory?

A - Career materials.

Forestine: NOTE: We, too, have career education laboratories. We are putting some of our YETP-purchased materials in these labs to supplement the other kinds of career materials already there. Our labs are open to all youth, not YETP youth only.

FIVE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DICCUSSION

- How to conduct a YETP effort for 14-15 year olds in ways that will be of maximum benefit to them (considering later possible ineligibility).
- What do LEAs and Prime Sponsors need to know about each other prior to beginning a YETP effort -- and how could this be accomplished?
- How to get better planning cycles between CETA and LEAs so that joint planning can take place.
- What are the learner outcomes of YETP? -- i.e., how should youth be different after completing a full YETP program?

- How to best use the expertise unique to each segment of the community in a YETP effort rather than having any one part pretending to have expertise which, in fact, is more readily available in some other part of the community.

On the matter of academic credit for YETP

Forestine: Our YETP enrollees receive one Carnegie Unit of academic credit for 120 hours of YETP experience.

Jerry: We give academic credit for YETP.

Audrey: We, too, give academic credit for YETP.

Tim: We give academic credit in Boston.

Sandy: We do not have academic credit for YETP in West Fargo.

Issue: How to conduct a YETP effort for 14-15 year olds in ways that will be of maximum benefit to them (considering later possible ineligibility)

Jerry: We noted 14-15 year olds were eligible in the YETP guidelines; because we wanted to include everyone eligible in those guidelines, we put in for a 14-15 year old effort.

Sandy: I do not know. I was not there when this decision was made.

Audrey: Our teachers and administrators thought an emphasis on 14-15 year olds would help serve the needs of some students. Further, it fit in very well with our overall K-12 career education program.

Forestine: We put in for a 14-15 year program in YETP because the rules and regulations make it possible and because we want to do all we can to help economically disadvantaged youth. A majority of our 14-15 year old YETP enrollees are persons with handicaps.

Issue: What do LEAs and Prime Sponsors need to know about each other prior to beginning a YETP effort -- and how could this be accomplished?

Forestine: A joint orientation session, involving both LEA and Prime Sponsor persons, should be planned jointly by LEAs and Prime Sponsors to include such topics as clarifying the meaning of the YETP rules and regulations.

Audrey: Showing how the structures of the Prime Sponsor and the LEA work.

Audrey: Explaining the basic operating policies of the Prime Sponsor and of the LEA.

Walter: Discussing objectives and goals (i.e., aspirations) of both the Prime Sponsor and of the LEA with respect to what this YETP effort is to accomplish, stated in both general and in specific terms.

Sherm: The YETP goals and objectives, as stated in the rules and regulations, are so vague you can not find in them any set of specific goals such as Walter thinks we need.

Forestine: DISAGREE. By having Prime Sponsor and LEA share the goals each has for YETP, we can develop some mutually acceptable set of goals for a particular YETP program.

Sherm: But can you also develop mutual agreements regarding how such "mutual goals" are going to be evaluated?

Sandy: We had an orientation session last fall called by our State Department of Education and our State Employment Service. Our purpose was to share concerns, BUT it wound up by finding each of us telling the other what we could not do.

Forestine: This kind of orientation session is needed, but it is going to take a really committed person to run it. We need to avoid a debate or a mutual criticism session.

Sandy: The intentions of everyone in our orientation program were good. What we needed was an expert to give us answers when questions were raised.

Audrey: Things change too rapidly in YETP to count on having any "expert" come in and give us the "answers" as though they are written on stone tablets. Maybe it would be better, in an orientation session of this kind, to set the goal of working out some answers that are, as of today, mutually acceptable to both the Prime Sponsor and the LEA. If we, as a Prime Sponsor and as an LEA, can agree on what we think the YETP rules and regulations allow us to do, we probably would not be far wrong. If we further put the rationale behind our mutual thinking in writing, we will have direction for what we are doing if and when we ever need it.

Linda: In Mississippi, we started by making up a very careful RFP from the Prime Sponsor's office, spelling out exactly what was to be done and the monitoring/evaluation performance standards to be applied. Then, after the LEAs and CBOs had responded to the RFP, we held a one-week orientation session at which we discussed with them, point by point, what they must do to live up to the requirements of the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

Audrey: As an LEA person, I would have liked it better had I been given an opportunity to become involved in writing the RFP, rather than simply responding to it.

Linda: Our State Planning Council had to approve the RFP. Educators are represented on that Council and had input into the final form of the RFP. Further, after a particular LEA had given us an initial response to the RFP, we called it in separately and worked with it, in a cooperative way, in developing its final response. Ours really was an effort to work to mutual agreements.

Sandy: Did you run, or consider running, workshops for LEAs and CBOs on how to respond to the RFP you sent out in Mississippi?

Linda: No. The RFP itself was clearly enough written so this was not necessary. An LEA had only to fill in percentages; the narrative was already written.

Ed: You cannot possibly cover all questions LEAs might have, no matter how well an RFP is written. The Prime Sponsor should have a workshop for prospective respondents to the RFP in addition to orientation workshops for those LEAs with whom agreements are eventually signed. It would be good public relations, if nothing else.

Linda: Time would rarely permit this to happen.

Sherm: AGREE WITH LINDA. Each fall, the Prime Sponsor is faced with the necessity of planning lots of programs (of which YETP is only one) in a very short time frame (usually no longer than two months). With this compressed planning time, rather than spread out over the entire year, it is very hard for CETA Prime Sponsors to do really adequate planning for any CETA program. It is not just with YETP that the Prime Sponsor faces this problem.

Audrey: If planning is not thought of, and carried out, as a continuing process, you lose the essential meaning of "planning" itself. Plans are meant to be changed when new facts are known or new conditions come into existence -- such as issuance of a brand new set of YETP rules and regulations. That is inherent in the planning process itself.

Linda: DISAGREE. You can plan specifically only when the guidelines come out.

Tim: DISAGREE WITH LINDA. We could involve both LEA and CETA planning persons in a broad goal discussion of YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements. Specific changes could then be made, as necessary, when the final guidelines come out.

Sherm: AGREE WITH LINDA. CETA is at best a short term planning effort. It would be ridiculous, for example, to think about a broad range "five-year plan" for YETP.

Sandy: Without an expert who really has answers, we cannot get mutual agreements on answers to questions such as "who qualifies as a YETP enrollee?" When neither the LEA nor the Prime Sponsor knows the exact answer to that question, having them share their ignorance is not going to result in accurate knowledge.

Audrey: DISAGREE. If we can get mutual agreements between Prime Sponsors and LEAs on WHAT we want to do and on HOW we want to do it, we can then adapt, in any necessary way, after the final rules and regulations come out. That is, we should not have to start out "naked" after the rules and regulations come out. We could at least see what would be really good to do, and discover, after the final rules and regulations come out, how much of what would be really good to do could be carried out. We need to "put the puzzle" together first, and then be prepared to adapt some pieces of that "puzzle" later.

Forestine: AGREE. A continuing planning process is very important. An orientation workshop that gives us even a preliminary plan is better than no plan at all.

Linda: DISAGREE. When you start to modify an "ideal plan," the result may well be so different that you would not even recognize the "ideal plan" you dreamed up.

Forestine: A general orientation session was conducted this year that helped LEAs know what Prime Sponsors are up against relative to changes in rules and regulations, including the fact that things may change in ways that none of us, LEAs or Prime Sponsors, can control at the local level. LEAs are able to appreciate the kinds of problems that the Prime Sponsor faces.

Issue: How to get better planning cycles between CETA and LEAs so that joint planning can take place

Audrey: If a Prime Sponsor is aware of the continuum of services available to youth, it can help in LEA/Prime Sponsor joint planning efforts. For example, in our LEA, we started last fall planning for the 1979-80 school year. If we can bring in CETA funds wihout making those funds an integral part of the regular school budget, it would help.

Jerry: DISAGREE. Most of the funds that come to an LEA represent "soft money" -- i.e., things like athletic receipts, meal charges, etc. When you talk about "hard money," you are talking in most LEAs primarily about teacher salaries and, at least in Mississippi, this does not apply because YETP "teachers" are not a part of the State certification system for regular teachers.

Audrey: That is not the case in Madison. All of the YETP teachers are certificated persons.

Jerry: A bigger problem, in my opinion, is that there exists no feedback system from the SEA to the LEA for YETP similar to the kind of feedback system that exists for other kind of Federal programs in which we participate.

Linda: In Mississippi, we are using the Meridian School district as a demonstration site to see how CETA linking money can be used to tie YETP in with the existing career education effort.

Jerry: When I say "feedback," I am referring to a two-way system. A part of it, for example, can be seen in operations of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education which has LEA representatives on it, listens to other LEAs, and then provides advice to the Federal Government regarding vocational education. There is no analogous body of educators existing as a National Advisory Board to give feedback and suggestions for policy and program operations to the U.S. Department of Labor. There should be such a body.

Walter: What percent of the Governor's money is actually available for "linking" services?

Linda: It is one percent of Title II funding, I believe. In Mississippi, over a half million dollars is set aside for linking services. In addition to this, however, approximately 25 percent of the Governor's Youth Grant is devoted to career education, and ten percent of the special grant to the Governor is used as an educational linkage grant.

Tim: In Massachusetts, we have $1.1 million for "linking," of which about $400,000 will go this year to an offender rehabilitation center for use in coordinating and linking with various kinds of community services for ex-offenders. We are currently looking for State linkages to other kinds of State agencies. These "linkage" funds are not limited to any one particular group.

Linda: We are using money from other federal sources (other CETA Programs, such as YIEP) for linking, so it is not that much of a problem for us.

Audrey: We just had a meeting to talk about what to do with this "one percent Governor's linking money." Educational institutions, K-12 school systems through higher education, Prime Sponsors, and program officers were involved. They discussed a variety of issues such as:

- How to grant academic credit for employment
- How to help K-12 school systems improve basic academic skill efforts
- How to change teacher education programs to fit today's schools
- Advanced standing - how to transfer from one type of institution to another without losing academic credits.

NOTE: This entire discussion concerning use of these funds extended far beyond a discussion of linking with CETA.

Tim: This "one percent linking money" is for linkages with CETA, not just with YETP, and certainly not for linkages that do not involve CETA in one or more of its parts. Whether or not any of it is used for "linking" with career education/YETP efforts is optional. There is a great need for developing better "linkages" at the State level, and that is primarily what these "linking" funds are for.

The CETA State Planning Council is willing, to be sure, to fund demonstration projects on "linking" at the local community level, but looks to individual Prime Sponsors to find the implementation funds required to make "linking" work at this local level.

Audrey: Our SEA has been cooperating with our CETA State Planning Council and meeting to talk about cooperative/collaborative relationships. This effort, in Wisconsin, is separate from "linking" efforts, using the Governor's "six percent set-aside" earmarked specifically for vocational education. In Wisconsin, "vocational education" has its own State Board, operates primarily at the postsecondary level, and is not directly associated with the State Department of Public Instruction's K-12 efforts. There is however, coordination of activities to varying degrees.

Tim: The Department of Labor is going to have to decide, before very long, the relative emphasis it wants to put on YETP as compared with all other CETA responsibilities. At this point in time, I find myself having more trouble fitting in with the schools on YCCIP than I do on YETP. If "linking" is our goal, then YETP is, in my opinion, the best single CETA effort for use in establishing "linkages" between CETA Prime Sponsor and LEAs.

Issue: What are the learner outcomes of YETP? -- i.e., how should youth be different after completing a YETP program?

Audrey: A person who has gone through YETP should: (a) have a career plan, (b) have general employability skills, and (c) be able to find a job on his/her own in the private sector.

Ed: It seems to me that, if you are going to evaluate YETP using criteria such as Audrey is proposing, you would have to use two groups: (a) a group exposed to a good YETP effort and (b) a control group of similar kinds of youth who are denied the ability to participate in YETP.

Sherm: Audrey's criteria sound to me like the same thing we used to do in NYC.

Audrey: DISAGREE. NYC concentrated, supposedly, on giving youth specific vocational skills; whereas YETP, with its major emphasis on general employability skills, is much more like career education. NYC was more like vocational education.

Forestine: I question whether or not YETP youth should be expected to have a "career plan" prior to entering YETP, or even when some of them finish the career exploration phase (ages 14-15). I do not think this is a reasonable criterion for use.

Linda: Even with the total YETP effort operating in an optimally efficient and effective manner, I doubt that we have sufficient time for helping all participants come up with a realistic "employability plan." I do not think it is possible to really tell, at this point in time, what the "finished YETP product" should be.

Forestine: We talk about "employability skills," but we have not talked about the specific occupations to which they are to be related.

Peggy: That is not important. The basic purpose of YETP is to expose youth to the real world of work so that they know and understand for example, the importance of coming to work on time, doing the best they can, cooperating with others, etc. It does not really matter what occupation you are talking about; the "employability skills" that YETP tries to give youth are ones required in any occupation.

Forestine: I guess we need to say specifically what we mean when we use the term "employability skills."

Jerry: The term "employability skills" refers to the kinds of attitudes that will keep the youth from being fired. It has been known for some time that 90 percent of the people fired from their jobs are released because of their poor work attitudes. That is part of what is wrong with vocational education. It spends 90 percent of its time giving youth specific vocational skills and it is not the lack of such skills that gets most of them fired from their jobs.

Peggy: We have discovered that specific vocational skills given to youth by vocational education, while important, are not all that they need. Our emphasis in YETP should be on giving our enrollees these basic employability skills. This is what is really most important.

Tim: AGREE WITH PEGGY. For example, we have a 30-week computer training course in our CETA operations. Only 12 weeks is spent on learning the computer language; the remaining time is devoted to providing CETA enrollees with the kinds of general employability skills Peggy has been talking about here.

Linda: It has been my experience, in CETA youth programs, that our so-called "Employability Development Plans" are placing their prime emphasis on finding and getting youth into immediately available job slots, not on giving them the kinds of basic employability skills we are talking about here. The people who really need to be sold on this are those responsible for planning YETP implementation. As of now, "employability development plans" are, in practice, translated to mean "find a job quick for this unemployed, economically disadvantaged youth."

Tim: We have surely learned, from our old CETA Title I efforts, that providing only vocational education (i.e., specific vocational skills) is not enough. In addition, we simply must concentrate on work attitudes. YETP is not intended to give youth specific vocational skills, and should not be expected to.

Sherm: AGREE WITH TIM. We ought to de-emphasize, in our YETP evaluation procedures, the area of "placement coupled with specific vocational skills" and instead choose evaluative criteria that emphasize general employability skills.

Peggy: I think those of us who work in Prime Sponsor offices can sell the notion of developing positive work attitudes as a major goal of YETP. We can justify it simply by pointing to the fact that such an emphasis would make youth more ready for a summer SPEDY experience, thus avoiding some of the current criticism SPEDY is receiving.

Tim: AGREE. In addition to using "SPEDY readiness" as a selling point, we can also convince Prime Sponsor decision-makers that a YETP emphasis on providing youth with general employability skills would be viewed with favor by the private sector and would thus be a good vehicle for use in hooking up CETA with the private sector.

Jim: It is interesting to see how the major emphasis of CETA has shifted: (a) three years ago, the major emphasis of CETA was on jobs; (b) two years ago, the major emphasis of CETA was on training coupled with jobs; (c) NOW (at least in YETP), it is obvious that the major emphasis of CETA is on providing general employability skills.

It is really not so much a matter of one emphasis replacing another in the total CETA effort so much as it has been a matter of expanding the total scope of CETA so as to include some additional kinds of emphasis.

Jim: There is a cultural change coming about in the private sector. There is not the same high degree of job security that used to exist. More and more, in today's private sector, if you cannot produce, you are fired. Demonstrated performance is the "name of the game" today.

I believe that Prime Sponsors are ready to accept an emphasis on general employability skills for the YETP portion of CETA. After we sell this notion to the Prime Sponsors, they are going to have to take this "new image" and sell it to the private sector. Businesses simply are not ready today to put up with inefficiency. The private sector today demands performance, and CETA is going to have to face this.

Sandy: Our SEA in North Dakota is doing a state-wide evaluation of YETP. Then it gives feedback to the four LEAs in the State participating in YETP.

Tim: Our SEA would not come in to look at our YETP efforts. If it came to CETA Prime Sponsors, it has been coming in the past with a "vocational education" emphasis of complaining about things such as lack of fully certificated teachers, etc. -- not looking at performance, as Jim is emphasizing, but only at what it regards as "qualifications."

Issue: How to best use the expertise unique to each segment of the community in a YETP effort rather than having any one part pretending to have expertise which, in fact, is more readily available in some other part of the community

Sandy: We have to start by sharing planning efforts. In West Fargo, it may be easier because we are not a big metropolitan area. I can see where this would be hard to do in a large city.

Ed: There are lots and lots of CBOs in Boston. Boston itself is basically a "city of neighborhoods." Each organization should use its own expertise. This is not being done now, because each organization has a different perspective on what needs to be done, and has an equally serious problem of "protecting its turf."

Audrey: At the community level, we get "negative brownie points," not positive ones, for cooperating with CBOs. Further, nobody has "cooperation" built into his/her job description and is seldom evaluated on whether or not she/he "cooperates" with others in the community.

Peggy: DISAGREE. In Memphis, the Prime Sponsor is strongly encouraged to work with CBOs.

Tim: It would help if we could get away from funding a specific CBO to do one complete task, another to do a different kind of project, etc. If we could, in part, base funding of CBOs on their demonstrated ability to cooperate with one another, it would help quite a bit.

Linda: That, in effect, is what we do in Mississippi with our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements and in our contracts with CBOs. We list specific points on which we expect cooperation between the LEAs and the CBOs. You would be surprised how much better they have worked together since we put this in the contract!

Sherm: We have in Memphis a "CETA Multi-Service Center" in which a good many CBOs are housed. It took some time before some of them even realized that some of the others were in the same building! We have worked very hard and have been somewhat successful now in developing a "We, CETA" attitude to replace the former "Me-OIC," "Me-Urban League," kinds of attitudes that used to exist.

To establish linkages and cooperative working relationships, it is necessary to have some kind of consistency in program design based on mutual societal goals, not on specific individual program goals. Things like "poverty," "youth unemployment," and "economically disadvantaged" have been general societal problems that have been around for a long time and have been addressed by a number of different kinds of programs, some of which are still in existence. These broad kinds of societal problems do not go away. The only things that "go away" are some of the programs that tried to meet these societal needs and failed because they could not do it by themselves. If we recognize this and build our cooperative working relationships based on these kinds of broad societal goals -- and concentrate on the unique kinds of contributions each CBO can make toward meeting these goals -- it is possible that we would not have so many new programs fail.

Sandy: Because the proportion of youth in the labor market will decline in the next several years, the need for giving youth general employability skills is certain to increase. And so will the need for things like YETP and career education.

Jim: The major obstacle I see to community collaborative efforts is simply *time constraints*. Because one gets no "brownie points" for "collaboration," collaboration does not get a high priority from anyone.

Audrey: "Collaboration" *is* my job in Madison, since my salary is paid in part by the LEA and in part by our local Chamber of Commerce. One of the biggest problems I see in collaboration is identifying where all the sources of expertise really exist in our broad community.

Linda: We, the Prime Sponsor, think of ourselves as a "community coordinating agency." We do not see ourselves as being able to operate effectively unless we *do* find ways of working cooperatively with groups such as the Employment Service, LEAs, and CBOs.

Jerry: In retrospect, it seems to me we all ought to be pleasantly surprised and pleased to find YETP working as well as it is. Granted, we have a long way to go. But we have come much further in only a year or two than many people thought we could.

Linda: AGREE. When I used to ask my standard question of, "How do you (the LEA) relate with CBOs in your community?" I would get non-positive answers. Recently, those answers have been very positive and encouraging. We *are* making progress.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 126

Career Employment Experience that Improves Career Decision Making Ability

April 17 and 18, 1979

Participants

Dr. Robert G. Brooks
Administrator
Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Providence School Department
Providence, Rhode Island

Mr. Ed Andrews
Assistant Operations Manager
Providence CETA Administration
Providence, Rhode Island

Mr. Ray Jarrett
Director of Vocational Education
Weber School District
Ogden, Utah

Mr. Craig Heninger
CETA Planner
Weber-Morgan CETA Consortium
Ogden, Utah

Mr. Laddie Livingston
Director of Curriculum, K-12
Delta County School District
Delta, Colorado

Ms. Jane Patterson
Staff Specialist BOS/CETA
Department of Labor and Employment
Denver, Colorado

Ms. Jean C. Abbott
Coordinator, C.E.E. Program
Aynor/Conway Career Center
Conway, South Carolina

Mr. George Chiotellis
Program Director/CETA
Department of Labor Resources
City of Savannah
Savannah, Georgia

Observers

Mr. Tim Napier
Career Planning Project Director
South Burlington School District
South Burlington, Vermont

Dr. Joseph Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Barbara Wilson
Career Education Project Administrator
South Burlington School District
South Burlington, Vermont

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, D.C.

Mr. David Faulkner
Lebanon High School
Lebanon, New Hampshire

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to increase participation of non-minority youth in YETP.

2. How to find and encourage school dropouts to participate in YETP, YCCIP, and SYEP.

3. How to make work experience slots related to career goals attractive enough to keep YETP youth from leaving for other kinds of part-time jobs.

4. How to help teachers of office education work more cooperatively, rather than competitively, with YETP.

5. How to overcome geographic barriers so that all parties in an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement can get together and communicate better with each other.

6. How to play up the "preparation for work" goal of YETP in these "back to basics" times.

7. How to get definitive answers to problems involved in making LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

8. How to solve the differences in time tables between LEAs and Prime Sponsors.

9. How to make a YETP effort act as leverage to providing YETP benefits to non-participating youth.

10. How to make the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement a priority item rather than a legal requirement.

11. How to avoid having the natural appeal of "cooperation" interfere with the need to continually improve existing programs.

12. What kinds of communication need to take place between LEAs and Prime Sponsors?

13. How to get more realistic financial requirements for YETP participation so that we can meet the needs of youth without the necessity for them to leave school, or to leave home, in order to become "income-eligible" for YETP.

14. How to most effectively make LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements when there is only one Prime Sponsor in the State and a great diversity among the LEAs.

15. How to make an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement which emphasizes the real local community problems rather than simply compliance with Department of Labor requirements.

16. How to best recruit eligible youth for *all* kinds of Department of Labor youth programs -- especially youth over 16 years old to be placed in the private sector.

17. How to make realistic and valuable LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements that meet needs of younger students not yet ready for work experience.

18. How to get people responsible for *implementing* an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement to understand it as well as those who *wrote* it.

19. Can the kinds of performance requirements found in YETP be attained (regardless of the amount of money that may become available)?

20. To what extent are the Department of Labor expectations for basic educational change realistic?

21. How can obstacles to involving the private sector in meaningful work experiences be overcome?

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Bob Brooks and Ed Andrews - Providence, Rhode Island

Bob (LEA representative)

We operate, under one agreement, both what is now called a Title II-B and a Title IV-A program with three major emphases: (a) classroom training, (b) work experience, and (c) career employment experience. Recruitment and eligibility requirements for youth participants is a CETA responsibility.

Once students are declared "YETP-eligible" by CETA, we in the LEA test each student using both the California Occupation Preference System (COPS), an interest survey, and the California Ability Placement Survey (CAPS), a measure of occupational abilities arranged by occupational clusters.

A "youth program goal" is developed for each YETP enrollee. If under age 16, YETP enrollees go directly into the work experience program. If over 16, they go into either: (a) Title IV "Career Employment Experiences" or (b) Title II-B classroom training.

Under both of these youth programs, trainees are provided with a variety of services including: (a) counseling (50:1 counselee/counselor ratio), (b) outreach and recruitment, (c) assessment and orientation, and (d) use of our Career Resource Center.

NOTE: Under our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement, each student receives "x" number of career counseling sessions.

Our "career employment experience" consists of 10 weeks of classroom training coupled with 10 weeks of related work experience. During the classroom training phase, each of the vocational education curricula areas involved has been developed by the particular teacher with a view to providing career exploration in a given curriculum area during the 10-week period. For example, a teacher of business education will present, in effect, an introduction to the entire field.

In addition, during this 10-week period, each student is exposed to a number of other general employability areas, (e.g., reduction of sex stereotyping, job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills). Prior to entering into the work experience phase, each enrollee is provided with intensive career counseling based on his/her "youth program goal" set of materials.

The 10 weeks of work experience is restricted to the public sector in an OJT format. Each YETP trainee has prepared a "work site agreement form" specifying, in a tailor-made fashion, the exact kinds of vocational skills the work experience aims to develop.

Our Title II-B program is, by and large, specific vocational skill training provided throughout the entire school year in classroom training or work experience.

Ed (Prime Sponsor representative)

We wanted to develop an interchange between CETA out-of-school counselors and regular school counselors. To help accomplish this, we now have a CETA counselor in the school whose job is to increase these linkages.

The "performance outcomes" in our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement were negotiated by the Prime Sponsor representative with the LEA evaluation specialist. During our first year of operation, the performance outcomes were stated in unrealistic form. As a result, we did not meet them. This year, having learned better, we are working with more realistic "performance indicators" which should help present a fairer picture when evaluation results are in.

Questions and Answers

Q - Who is ultimately responsible for keeping your local labor market information current?
A - CETA has some labor market analysts. We depend on them, our own data collection and on information fed us from the local Department of Employment Security.

Q - How many counselors do you have?
A - We have nine part-time counselors responsible for the "career employment experiences" program. These are regular school counselors employed by the LEA full-time during the school day. They work in this program, on a part-time basis, after the school day is finished. In addition, we have one full-time CETA counselor who, among other counseling duties, works with our regular school counselors during the day.

Q - Are you having any attendance problems with your YETP trainees?
A - Yes, but we are getting them solved.

Q - Is your "Career Resource Center" available to all students or only to those specifically covered in your LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement?
A - It operates out of our vocational education center and so, in this sense, is not as readily accessible to persons from throughout the city as we might like it to be. However, it is planned to be open all day to all students and to all staff persons who want to use it.

Q - Do you have a private sector work experience program yet?
A - Not yet. It is possible to do this. The problem is one of selling the private sector on "observation-like" experiences (as opposed to "producing actvities") as called for in YETP. Many private sector persons feel they have nothing to gain from such an arrangement. We do have NAB running a VEPS program for us in the private sector.

Q - When you do "classroom training" under your LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement, what does that consist of?
A - Those over age 16 are put into our Title II-B program of specific vocational skill training. Those under age 16 go into the 20-week "career employment experience" that includes 10 weeks of general career exploratory vocational training. For both age groups, we have at least two scheduled individual counseling sessions with one of our counselors.

Ray Jarrett and Craig Heninger - Weber County, Utah

Ray (LEA representative)

Prior to CETA, we had established a consortium of LEAs to pool and use, in an efficient and productive manner, the "15 percent money from vocational education." As part of this effort, our LEA volunteered to give this consortium an empty building which now serves as our COMMUNITY CAREER SERVICE CENTER. There are a total of six high schools and 13 junior high schools, and about 50,000 in-school youth in this consortium.

One of our priorities has been a conscious attempt to see that no youth "fails." Thus, when we see a kid in danger of failing in our regular program, we try to offer that youth some alternatives. We have a full-time "ALTERNATIVE PROGRAM COORDINATOR" at each of our comprehensive high schools, and have established a "COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL" which serves primarily youth in need of alternative education. This special school is housed at our "community career service center."

In addition, we have at this Center many other work/education services and facilities including space for vocational rehabilitation, organized labor, a branch of Job Services and Skills Center North.

Craig (Prime Sponsor representative)

We, the Prime Sponsor, get referrals from a number of different community agencies, including LEAs, for our various programs. We, in CETA, are responsible for determination of eligibility for participation in any CETA program. For youth participants, the central intake function is housed in the CETA offices.

CETA has a number of alternative programs available. We regard YETP as one of these. Many of the youth we in the Prime Sponsor's office have to deal with are school dropouts. We have a hard time finding interested, eligible in-school youth.

Our YETP program is heavily concentrated on assessment including use of the Career Awareness Laboratories (CAL), leading to an individual "EMPLOYABILITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN" drawn up for each YETP trainee. As the youth progresses, his/her progress is recorded in this "PLAN," which is continuously being re-evaluated. We try to have very good private sector relationships in our CETA offices. These relationships developed primarily as a result of our prior operation of the STIP program, which has helped substantially.

To monitor the "EMPLOYABILITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN," a team is formed for each youth consisting of some of her/his teachers, counselors, job coaches, parents, etc. This team is supposed to meet about once a month to review the PLAN and the youth's progress in that PLAN.

Our Skills Center operates completely on an open entry/open exit basis.

There is a strong emphasis in our YETP program on job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills. The combination of services we offer in this regard is called Job Readiness Posture (JRP). Our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement has three parts, each with different responsibilities:

LEA duties:

- referral of prospective YETP trainees
- preliminary screening
- arranging for award of academic credit
- personal development/counseling

Vocational Skills Center role (SKILLS CENTER NORTH):

- specific vocational skill training
- vocational counseling
- job development
- establishing and maintaining community linkages
- remedial basic education

CETA office role:

- screening
- planning
- monitoring
- evaluating
- administering

Questions and Answers

Q - How do you handle career information system update problems?
A - It is hard. Our basic tie-in is that State Employment Service people are physically present in our COMMUNITY CAREER SERVICE CENTER. We depend on them.

Q - Describe, in more detail, how your individual EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT PLAN works.
A - We call the team I described a "FACT" team. After its monthly meeting, the team reports back to the youth's counselor (who is a member of that team) and the counselor then initiates any required followup. The FACT team does not have any direct line authority.

Q - How do your SKILLS CENTER NORTH and your COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL relate?
A - The COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL provides academic training, as an alternative school. Our SKILLS CENTER NORTH school provides specific vocational skill training. SKILLS CENTER NORTH is a part of Weber State College, not of the Weber LEA.

Q - Do you have cooperative education in your regular high schools?
A - Yes, but dropout-prone youth are often better off in our cooperative vocational high school, which has much more individualized instruction (thanks to the fact that, in addition to regular per-pupil instructional costs, we receive additional per-pupil costs from sources such as CETA, P.L. 94-142, vocational rehabilitation, etc.).

Q - Explain your arrangement of "50-50 shared instructional costs" between CETA and the LEA.
A - We are talking here about training costs only, NOT work experience costs. CETA pays the stipends for YETP trainee work experience.

Q - Is the LEA "cost" reflective of training received during the school day?
A - Yes. All our YETP trainees are "in-school youth," enrolled in our COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL (*e.g.*, our alternative school). However, they may be enrolled in any one of our comprehensive high schools.

Q - Do YETP enrollees receive allowances for attending classes in your own COOPERATIVE VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL?
A - No, but they can if they take specific vocational skill training at our SKILLS CENTER NORTH facility.

Laddie Livingston and Jane Patterson - Delta County, Colorado

Laddie (LEA representative)

We are located in rural Western Colorado, in a part of the State where we must plan on exporting lots of our youth after they finish high school. Our YETP program goal is to improve the career decision-making ability of YETP youth.

In our community, we have lots of adults who think good Federal programs (like YETP) should not be limited in their availability to economically disadvantaged youth. Thus, our YETP plan of operation has been purposely designed to overcome this kind of negative community attitude, while still following the CETA laws with respect to formal participation only on the part of economically disadvantaged.

Our YETP program can be described as follows: We have 20 YETP enrollees which we have formed into four "CAREER TEAMS." It is as a member of a "team" that each enrollee receives YETP "work experience." The "team" is charged with providing career planning help to about 1,800 other youth who are not in one of the YETP slots. (NOTE: In our region, many of these 1,800 youth would, in an income sense, be "YETP-eligible.") We use our YETP work experience funds to pay the 20 members of our "career team" to get information needed by the other 1,800 youth.

Our plan begins by getting some interest/aptitude/career aspiration data from both 9th graders and from 12th graders. We then match a 9th grader with a 12th grader who has volunteered to help answer questions from the 9th grader. Under this system, when the 9th grader becomes a 10th grader, he/she maintains contact with his/her counterpart (who, of course, is now one year out of high school). This continues until our former 9th grader is now a 12th grader, at which point he/she picks up this same kind of relationship with a new 9th grader (while still maintaining contacts for a total of a seven-year period) with his/her original "matching person."

In addition to engaging in this "matching process," our YETP enrollees' work experience includes collecting a number of case studies from former students who have been out of high school for up to seven years. Most of them respond well when queried by these students about their career activities.

A third part of this YETP "work experience" is involved in doing a local labor market survey by conducting face-to-face interviews with all of the approximately 400 employers in Delta County.

It is our hope that each year our 20 YETP "team members" will accept responsibility for training next year's 20-person "YETP team" during the spring of the year. Eventually, we hope to see this system taken over by our LEA with no need for further Prime Sponsor funds.

By operating this YETP TEAM, it seems obvious that 100 percent of our students are gaining direct benefits from the YETP effort through what our YETP "team" does as its "work experience."

Jane (Prime Sponsor representative)

There are several partners involved in this project (10/1/78-5/31/79) including the COLORADO CAREER INFORMATION SYSTEM. The particular project that Laddie has described in Delta County is one of the "10 percent experimental YETP programs," including both income-eligible and non-income eligible youth. The goals of this project include: (a) to provide YETP enrollees with bona fide work experience; (b) to develop and make operational a local career information program; and (c) to test the mixing of income eligible and non-income eligible youth in terms of benefits accruing to income-eligible YETP youth.

Questions and Answers

Q - Why does your YETP program call for only 20 youth slots?
A - Because that is all the money we have. As it is, we are getting a little more than our proportionate share on a population/analysis of need basis in Colorado. The fact that we have lots and lots of economically disadvantaged youth does not, by itself, entitle us to more YETP slots.

Q - How many hours a week do your YETP enrollees work?
A - 10 hours per week. One hour of this is during each school day (for which enrollees receive academic credit in either English or social studies -- whichever class they substitute this experience for) and one hour each day after school.

Q - In this "10 percent project," are half of your YETP enrollees not income-eligible?
A - That is right.

Q - How does this "12th grader/9th grader match" work?
A - Theoretically, once we match them as 9th graders, they will stay hooked up with the same kid for the next three years.

Q - Are there noticeable differences in the questions youth really ask about careers (in this YETP program) and those found in the occupational information supplied by the Colorado Career Information System?

A - Yes, most definitely. Kids do not ask much about what the canned occupational information tells them they should want to know.

Q - How many 9th graders do these 20 YETP enrollees work with?

A - Three hundred and seventy.

Q - Is the information sent back by the out-of-school youth to your YETP "team" valid?

A - Yes, at least to the extent that team members do their best to "tell it like it is" to these younger youth who ask them what it has been like for them. And, after all, that is the kind of "validity" these younger youth are really seeking.

Q - How did you select the 20 youth to participate in this YETP program?

A - We picked from a larger group which indicated interest in participating.

Jean Abbott - Conway, South Carolina

Jean (LEA representative)

We began our YETP program in January, 1978 with our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement formally signed in March, 1978. Our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement calls for a combination of career employment experiences and transition services. All YETP enrollees are certified "eligible" by our State Employment Service (ES). Work sites for YETP enrollees are, under our plan, to be developed cooperatively by the Employment Service and the YETP person at each of our Career Centers. We have three "Career Centers" in our county.

You can understand our operation best if I tell you that my major job in our LEA is to serve as a full-time teacher of distributive education. I do this YETP job one hour per day (during the school day). The job includes: taking student applications for YETP, doing YETP pre-screening, talking with students about their career goals, helping each YETP trainee develop an individualized employability plan, and locating work sites that are compatible with the YETP enrollee's career goals.

NOTE: These are severely economically disadvantaged youth. It is amazing, and very rewarding to me, to see how this YETP experience has enriched their lives already and brightened their prospects for a good career future. I know I am really helping these students.

YETP youth work 10 hours per week during the school year and 25 hours per week during the summer months. Each has a minimum of two counseling interviews with our regular school-based counselors in addition to the counseling people like myself do with them. The prime purpose of our YETP program is to increase employability and to aid in the career development of these youth.

Each career center has both a "career employment experience" person and a classroom training program for school dropouts. We have 20 YETP slots. There are ample job slots in PSE. Participants are very well accepted by employers with whom we have placed them.

Questions and Answers

Q - How many persons are there like you in your county?
A - Three.

Q - How did you go about finding job work sites?
A - I was already doing it as part of my regular distributive education program so it was not something I did not know how to do.

Q - Did you find these work sites yourself?
A - Yes. After that, the Employment Service person then talks to the work site supervisor who signs the agreement to provide "X" experiences for the youth.

Q - How do non-income eligible youth get to participate in your YETP program?
A - They do not. We have a regular school cooperative education program available to them.

Q - How many students in all are you responsible for in your school system?
A - I have 50 regular distributive education students plus my 20 YETP students. One period per day is spent formally with my 20 YETP trainees. I teach three classes per day and, most of the rest of my time is spent in the community or working individually with my students.

Q - Does your YETP program operate under a financial agreement between the LEA and the Prime Sponsor?
A - Yes. Our LEA is reimbursed for the one hour per day I spend with these YETP youth. In addition, the LEA gets some YETP money for "indirect costs."

Q - Is there any other counseling built into this YETP program?
A - Yes. Each enrollee has two sessions with a regular school-based counselor.

George Chiotellis - Savannah, Georgia

George (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our YETP in-school program is an OJT-type program only. It is operated by our LEA through eight job counselors (one in each high school). Four of these eight counselor positions are regular school counselors paid for by the LEA while YETP funds 3 3/4 counselors in this program.

It is the counselor's responsibility in each school to: (a) secure OJT contracts, (b) select YETP youth for consideration, (c) perform pre-screening of youth being considered for YETP, and (d) engage in counseling of YETP youth.

We also have a school dropout program, operated by our Community Action Program, which is primarily a GED program for out-of-school youth. It combines four hours of work experience with four hours of basic education courses each day.

Obviously, much of the cost of this YETP effort is picked up by the school board. It does not cost the CETA Prime Sponsor much to operate it.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do your in-school YETP youth get "transition services"?

A - Yes. This program was designed for us by the LEA career education coordinator. He told us what was really needed to expand on the existing vocational education/career education efforts already being made available to youth. Everything that YETP counts as "transition services" was already being provided by the LEA, so we did not have to add them to our agreement and thus do not have to pay for them. Our whole intent, in designing this YETP program with the LEA, was to help the LEA expand its services to economically disadvantaged youth without upsetting the LEA's regular operations or interfering with those operations.

Q - Were the four regular school counselors who existed before YETP came along already experienced in writing OJT contracts?

A - No. This YETP program has meant a change in counselor role and function.

Q - What is the counselor/pupil ratio in the high schools where this YETP program is in operation?

A - We provide 3 3/4 professional counselors to take care of 200 YETP slots. Remember, this YETP effort is something in addition to the regular counseling program which was already going on for all students. What we did, in effect, was to almost double the number of regular school counselors and pay for them out of YETP funds in exchange for the LEA operating these 200 YETP slots.

Q - Do these school counselors get paid extra for their YETP participation?
A - No. This is something they do on top of their regular job as school counselors.

Q - Who makes the decisions with regard to eligibility for YETP participation?
A - Our State Employment Service.

Q - Does the school counselor have to certify that the YETP enrollee's work experience is directly related to his/her career goals?
A - Yes.

Q - How do you handle the academic credit problem?
A - These counselors, as job developers, will often develop a job for a specific youth in line with that youth's career goals. It is not like it would be if we had to take those work experience slots that are just sitting around in the Employment Service already developed. We do not try to fit a YETP youth into an existing work experience slot. Instead, we try to build the slot to meet the needs of each YETP youth.

Q - Do those employers with whom you place your YETP enrollees for work experience commit themselves to employ these youth when the program finishes?
A - No. There have been no problems in this area yet.

THREE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to get people responsible for IMPLEMENTING an LEA/ Prime Sponsor agreement to understand it as well as those who WROTE it.
- How to find and encourage school dropouts to participate in YETP, YCCIP, and SYEP.
- How can obstacles to involving the private sector in meaningful work experiences be overcome?

Issue: How to get people responsible for IMPLEMENTING an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement to understand it as well as those who WROTE it

Bob: Last year, we had a "non-financial" agreement for YETP, whereas this year we have both a "financial" and a "non-financial" agreement. The fact that we changed to a financial agreement meant that some transition of responsibility from the Prime Sponsor to the LEA had to occur. This makes for problems when one side thinks a statement means one thing and the other side takes it to mean something quite different. It is especially serious in that a lot of the people involved in writing the original agreement have changed jobs and are no longer around. There are only a few like myself who have been able to sit through all the various draft agreements that have been prepared.

As operating people in CETA and in the LEA were given copies of the signed LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement for this year, they did not all know what had gone into the discussion leading up to the wording of the agreement itself. It would recommend getting implementers involved in understanding the thinking and the frustrations involved in getting the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. If people involved understood more fully just how critical it was for some of the words to be there, they would have a better understanding and appreciation of what is involved in carrying out the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

Ray: AGREE. Compromise is the "name of the game" in hammering out a good LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. It takes three to four months to settle on its final wording. This year, it looked like we were at an impasse. Finally, taking a draft agreement written by our Prime Sponsor, I re-wrote it. We were then able to get LEA and Prime Sponsor persons together and agree on a series of compromises with respect to that re-write job.

Craig: When the Department of Labor issued guidelines for writing LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements, it left things very, very loose. The "planners" got together and "planned." THEN, they had to give the "plan" to program managers. The program managers did not get anything but general guidelines with respect to how they were to implement the "plan."

Walt: In Vermont, 11 LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements were initially funded. But after negotiations were finally completed between the Prime Sponsor and these 11 LEAs, five of 11 LEAs refused to participate. Is a "compromise" that does not find all parties sufficiently satisfied to continue their participation really a "compromise"?

Examples of ways in which "implementers" have experienced trouble following through on what the "planners" who wrote the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement put into it:

Craig: Our agreement called for the LEAs to "refer students most in need" for YETP, but it did not say how this was to be done.

Ed: Some "non-implementers" dream up the "performance indicators" to be used for evaluating the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement effort. BUT because "implementers" were not involved in the discussion that led up to adoption of such "standards," the "implementers" now find the "standards" are so high that they cannot be met.

Bob: The role of the "program monitor" is not clear with respect to program goals.

Jean: As one of the "implementers," I have been told absolutely nothing about the planning that went on in establishing our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

Jane: We need to learn how to better tie in "monitor" findings with discussions of the program planning people so that future planning can be better.

Craig: It is ironic that the Federal Government is now saying that "monitoring and evaluation" must be independent of "program mamagement."

Jean: Our monitor has given me the greatest help of anyone in terms of what I, as an "implementer," am doing in our YETP project.

Craig In our area, we have an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement separate from the "program contracts" for each agency. The program coordinators actually write up the contracts from the kinds of general statements found in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. If an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement could be written in more specific form, it would help in accomplishing that task.

Ray: DISAGREE. We do not want the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement written in too specific a fashion. For example, our Prime Sponsor wrote in a requirement that all CETA youth go through a central clearinghouse in order to determine their eligibility. When put into operation, we found this made serious problems for the LEAs (in terms of letting kids out of school to go to the "central clearinghouse" and in knowing when to expect them to get back during the school day).

We were able to modify the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement because the agreement itself was written so loosely. Had it been too tightly written, we might not be participating today. The modification we put in was one that called for Prime Sponsor personnel to do pre-screening at the building level, thus cutting down greatly on the number of youth we had to send to the central clearinghouse.

Laddie: In our community, the "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement" is something that we keep re-negotiating year-round so that is not the problem. The problem is that, in planning, we make "deals" that have to be translated into implementation negotiations. The critical point is that the problem of negotiating what is to be done is different from negotiating how it is to be done.

George: No "Fed" has ever told me that we must include performance standards in our contracts. If you put strict performance standards into a contract, you will be faced with continual negotiation. We find ourselves much better off with a very simple three-page "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement" that merely spells out what the LEA is to do and what the Prime Sponsor is to do.

Jane: We do have to put specific performance standards in our contracts.

Ed: So do we.

Bob: We do not seem to have any real problems getting either the LEA or the Prime Sponsor to agree to re-negotiating when one or the other feels it is necessary, but we have found it necessary to put everything we agree to in these "re-negotiations" into writing. If we do not, misunderstandings seem to inevitably arise.

Ed: Theoretically, we can negotiate an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement that contains no performance standards of any kind, but our Department of Labor Regional Office keeps asking us for data which makes us get more specific in terms of performance standards. We then have to ask for these data from the LEA. The performance standards are more specific than either the Prime Sponsor or the LEA, operating at the community level, would like to see, or feels is necessary. But, because of insistence of our Department of Labor Regional Office, we find ourselves with no choice.

Jane: AGREE. The whole CETA approach has been built on the concept of local control and autonomy, under the assumption that each local community is in a better position to assess its needs than are the "FEDS." Yet, each time the Federal rules and regulations are re-written (and this seems to be going on all the time), they become more stringent and more truly difficult for us to translate into really good LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements that are truly appropriate for a particular community.

George: The Federal rules and regulations are loose enough now. Let us hope that they can be kept that way.

Ed: BUT, in spite of this "looseness," when the Department of Labor Regional Office insists on putting things in a much more specific form, we, the local Prime Sponsor, have to pass those requirements on to each of our subcontractors, including the LEAs.

Bob: The LEAs are not resisting the concept of performance standards, but they want and need input into determining the realism of such standards before they are promulgated in final form.

Issue: How to find and encourage school dropouts to participate in YETP, YCCIP, and SYEP

George: These three programs typically cover two broad groups of youth: (a) the economically disadvantaged in-school youth and (b) school dropouts. We have lots of problems finding the school dropouts we are supposed to be serving.

We assume that: (a) these dropouts are economically disadvantaged and (b) the lack of a high school diploma is keeping them from finding and holding good jobs. Thus, we place a major emphasis on working towards GED attainment.

In our SYEP project, we have a goal of including 10 percent school dropouts. It is doubtful if this goal can be met. The population is there, but we cannot find the dropouts.

Laddie: Do you not have access to Title I, ESEA data? The LEA persons responsible for this *must* do an annual dropout study giving names, last known addresses, phone numbers, and name(s) of person(s) the dropout was last known to be living with. These should be available to you.

Ed: The basic problem is not one of simply *finding* the dropouts, but rather of talking them into coming into the program. This year, we subcontracted with CBOs to find dropouts and encourage them to enroll in our out-of-school YETP program. The school's list of dropouts did not help us much.

Ray: DISAGREE. We *do* have a problem finding dropouts. We often do not know where they are even one day after they quit school. Moreover, in most communities, and especially urban areas, there are dropouts from other places moving into the community on almost a daily basis. There is no way of getting a "list" of such youth from LEAs.

Ed: Our CBOs *are* successful in getting kids from the neighborhood each works with best.

Ed: One of the problems is the standard "CETA intake system." Under this system, the CETA personnel are supposed to provide the applicant with a list of all kinds of CETA "options" that conceivably could be made available to him/her. Often, as a result, the youth is not given an adequate basis of choosing YETP over, say, PSE. With our new YETP arrangement with CBOs, the CBOs steer the youth through the YETP intake -- *i.e.*, they do not give the youth ALL the options. Instead, they zero in on YETP. We justify this by saying it is better to go for a GED than just a PSE job.

Bob: When the youth drops out, we can get his/her name to CETA fast; but to deal with this situation, CETA also needs to know the reason(s) why the youth dropped out. Usually, the stated reason is "to take a job." If we offer dropouts a YETP program where their only option is to go back into classroom training, it does not help motivate them much, even with the work experience stipend attached. If part of the reason for dropping out was the school itself, it is harder yet to get them back into school.

Laddie: It is silly to think LEAs can help very much. After all, it is the LEA they ran away from! We provide high school dropouts we recruit for YETP with work experience aimed directly at recruiting other high school dropouts to join the YETP program. This is meaningful work experience.

Jean: Do you use the Employment Service listing of high school dropouts who are looking for jobs?

George: Yes, BUT many high school dropouts are not looking for jobs, so they are not on that Employment Service list.

Ray: Peers are the best contact persons. Almost all dropouts in our community have some contact with our Community Service Center. It is here where one dropout can influence another.

Jane: We have the same set of contractors dealing with both in-school and out-of-school youth. As a result, they have access.

Ed: We find it best to use the CBO to offer the GED training, too, rather than sending the youth back into the school she/he dropped out of. One advantage of this is that the youth can go into a program in his/her local neighborhood. We are having much better luck with this approach. Youth participating in YETP programs located in the neighborhood are the best recruiters of other high school dropouts who now live in that neighborhood.

Bob: The problem with high school dropouts is finding appropriate placement for the work experience portion of YETP, not in determining which eduational setting he/she comes back to.

Ed: Bob is talking about our in-school program. In our out-of-school program, placement in a work experience portion of YETP is not typically a part of YETP. No more than 25 percent of out-of-school YETP enrollees would be getting work experience. Most of them get a combination of GED training and transition services.

George: Our local CBO (Community Action Agency) does administer our out-of-school YETP program, but the Employment Service is given the subcontract for outreach and recruiting. The Employment Service tends not to do this very well. If we want to improve, we have got to find some alternative to simply using the Employment Service for outreach and recruiting.

Ed: AGREE. The Employment Service is not the proper recruitment agency. What we recognized was that we (CETA) could not find these kids either. We initially went to the community centers and asked them to do it voluntarily for altruistic reasons. That did not work because no money was involved. It worked only when we made a financial subcontract with various CBOs to do this on a neighborhood basis. When we started paying for it to CBOs, then it worked.

George: We find both CAP and OIC wanted us to fund them to do recruitment. We have avoided this because: (1) it is an extra administrative cost; and (2) it is a normal legal requirement of Employment Service, so we cannot justify paying someone else to do it.

Ed: We do okay with neighborhood CBOs so long as we do not go with one of the "biggies" (like OIC) where the overhead is so high.

Jean: We do not fund recruitment efforts but rather "career employment experiences" with CBOs. It amounts to the same thing; i.e., if they want to get the money for "career employment experiences" they have got to get out and recruit YETP youth to fill the slots. We, too, have found Employment Service not to be very helpful in outreach and recruiting.

Ed: Most CBOs involved with our high school dropout program have other kinds of CETA programs also. Some of the persons in these programs can, and do, help in recruiting high school dropouts for YETP.

George: I wish we could quit using the term "meaningful work experience." "Meaningful" is not a very meaningful word!

Bob: AGREE. Some of the youth who have been in SYEP for more than one year become so disillusioned they do not want to do it a second year.

Jane: DISAGREE. In the summer, we take lots of youth from rural Colorado to Denver for a few weeks of SYEP. There, during the late afternoon and evening hours, we are able to arrange for them to do such things as visit museums, go to movies, etc., which they could not possibly do in the small, rural communities from which they came. It can be, and is a very "meaningful" educational experience for them.

Ray: What is "meaningful" to a youth depends, in part, on how familiar he/she is with it. For example, we have trouble recruiting high school youth in our area to pick fruit in the summer but they will go to Texas to do pit cleaning or to Hawaii to pick pineapples. Maybe this would be a way of making SYEP more attractive and "meaningful." If we could switch kids out of their immediate local communities it might work, even if we ask those youth to pay for their own transportation and living costs while out there.

Ed: Our biggest problem with SYEP is policing of kids -- i.e., making sure they do not smash windows, drink on the job, etc. IF we could move them out of the inner city (as Ray suggests) and into a more positive environment, it might help. HOWEVER, it would not be practical to ask these youth to pay their own transportation or living costs.

The real answer to making SYEP evaluations look better is to be more realistic about the goals of SYEP. You cannot get basic, positive attitudinal changes among these youth in only a nine-week program.

Ray: You do not change these basic attitudes by giving kids a dole either. We have to somehow develop a sense of self worth, and that means we have got to show these youth that what we are asking them to do is to be productive, to be helpful to society. If we can show them that there is a way these youth could manage to pay their own transportation and housing costs to get out of the immediate community during the summer, then it is worth doing. It would be better for the youth than would be the case were the "Feds" to subsidize it.

Laddie: One of the things kids most often ask is, "IS THIS A REAL JOB?"

Ed: DISAGREE. Our kids would choose recreation over productive jobs if you gave them that choice.

Jean: The only long-run way you are going to change these work values is to teach YETP youth something about parenting -- so that *their* children will be better off. (Note: many of them are even now parents.) It is a long-run solution we must seek.

Bob: AGREE. The earlier we start, the better.

Ray: Why *can't* we do something with parents? We have really got to start no later than kindergarten.

Craig: While we are waiting for these obviously much needed long-run solutions, we are faced with doing something positive for these YETP youth *now*. The problem most of them face is their dependency. We have got to give them a "jump start." This is what we try to do in our pre-employment training at Skills Center North. The result has been to emphasize the positive, and to see lots of kids now finding their own jobs rather than continuing to depend on a CETA "job developer."

Issue: How can obstacles to involving the private sector in meaningful work experiences be overcome?

Ed: The regulations themselves involve great obstacles to youth involvement in the private sector. That is, the regulations say that if you put youth into the private sector, you cannot have them doing things that will be "productive" for the employer. In addition, you must obtain collective bargaining sign-offs from organized labor. Finally you have employers asking questions such as: "Why should I get involved?" "What is in it for me?" We have no good answers to give them.

We have a model program in Providence now, funded through National OIC and involving two hours of classroom training per day coupled with four hours of bona fide productive work in the private sector (for which CETA, not the employer, pays the youth wages). The kids *are* being productive. This model is NOT in line with current SYEP rules and regulations. But if the rules and regulations could be changed so that we could all do this, it would be a good thing.

Jean: We started in distributive education in our LEA with a program in which kids worked for private employers *without pay* as interns for three weeks. Often, those youth found jobs with the employers they went to as interns from this program. That could be a model for SYEP to consider.

Ray: Aren't you having problems with labor laws on this? We are. Organized labor claims it is not fair to have a youth do *productive work* for no wages. For example, in our community, organized labor has insisted that kids in our EBCE program only "observe." No "hands on" experience is permitted when they go into the private sector.

George: CETA rules and regulations DO provide for "hands on" experiences so long as they are not productive.

Ray: The Federal and State child labor laws need some revision.

Bob: The SYEP program starts after June 15 when our regular in-school YETP program ends. This year, CETA will *not* operate SYEP through the Prime Sponsor office. Instead, it has issued RFPs to local agencies (including the LEA) under four options: (a) classroom training, (b) work experience, (c) special projects, or (d) VEPS. We submitted six types of projects from our LEA: one work experience, one classroom training, and four "special projects" (*e.g.*, art projects, theatre projects, etc.). The point is, when you have so *many* youth in the summer coming in so *quickly*, it is hard to make any experience *meaningful* in the private sector.

The private sector operates a form of accountability that is reflected in the employer/employee relationship. In this RFP process, by asking each agency to say what it plans to do, each shares in the accountability. (NOTE: Private sector firms are not legally agencies that could respond to this RFP nor assume responsibility for providing work experience.)

Ed: We have an RFP response now from NAB, but this would not do it in terms of private sector involvement. I would like to see the rules and regulations changed so that

CETA funds can be used for pre-employment experience with youth rather than trying to rush youth into the private sector each summer. Currently, the rules and regulations prohibit this.

Ed: Why can't we get youth work experience in the private sector? In the public sector where we now have to place kids, many of the full-time employees do not themselves have what they consider to be "meaningful" work. How can experience in that kind of setting be "meaningful" to youth?

Bob: You can find a public sector alternative to the private sector IF these youth were to become bona fide employees of the public agency, rather than getting their checks directly from SYEP. The problem is that many public agencies do not want to or are not able to accept payroll responsibilities.

Ed: There is a real question as to whether or not the public agency can handle that kind of payroll without misusing the funds!

Jean: Eighty percent of the YETP youth we now have in public agency work will be employed by their agency when our YETP effort ends. We could take the distributive education model and make it work for YETP youth IF we included the skill training component of distributive education in -- plus the time provisions of distributive education. But there is no provision in YETP for this. When, in distributive education, I have worked with a youth for two years, I can help her/him. But when a YETP youth just walks in, I cannot provide "instant help" in the form of meaningful work experience. If I could just have contact with my YETP kids each day to talk about what happened yesterday on the job, it would help; but there is no time for me to do that.

David: The main difference is that distributive education students have been given a skill which is not true of SYEP youth.

Jean: Our local vocational education advisory council is primarily private sector people. They help us get our distributive education kids into the private sector.

Jane: Our contractors do not want to touch the VEPS program because the restrictions are so severe. In addition, the goals really are not attainable. If the youth is doing anything worthwhile, he/she will be contributing to productivity, and thus violating the VEPS rules and regulations. Our vendors would very much like to work in the private sector with these youth programs, but it is simply too hard with these kinds of restrictions.

Ed: The trouble with finding "meaningful" work experience for youth in the public sector is that full-time employees in the public sector do not themselves have "meaningful" work. The work habits youth tend to learn in public service employment are, basically, bad work habits. The only solution is to put these youth in the private sector. We simply must find some way to change these rules and regulations.

NAB is not the answer. NAB wants to outstation kids in the private sector who have been "creamed" from the pool of disadvantaged inner city youth we are supposed to work with. They do not take the typical kid.

Jane: The rub between CETA and the private sector is that the private sector is not set up to provide needed support services to kids; it is set up to make a profit. If we could do private sector work combined with good support services, it would help.

Bob: We ought to be willing to let some PSE employees provide these "support services," since it would be good for them to spend some time in the private sector.

Ed: The goals of YETP are much more realistic and attainable than are the goals of many other youth programs found in the CETA legislation.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 128

Provision of All Transition Services

April 26 and 27, 1979

Participants

Ms. Jama Roman
Career Development Supervisor
Toledo Public Schools
Toledo, Ohio

Mr. James T. Beshalske
CETA Youth Programs Supervisor
Toledo Area CETA Consortium
Toledo, Ohio

Mr. John Sedey
Director of Vocational Education,
Pupil Personnel Services and
Alternative Programs
St. Paul, Minnesota

Ms. Ann Hagestad
Operations Manager
Ramsey County CETA
Arden Hills, Minnesota

Mr. Robert W. Bassard
Work Experience/CETA Coordinator
Hacienda La Puente Unified School
District
City of Industry, California

Dr. Harry C. Holmberg
CETA Youth Programs Manager
Office of the Los Angeles County
Superintendent of Schools
Downey, California

Ms. Marilyn Wiltz
Vocational Counselor
Mukilteo School District
Mariner High School
Everett, Washington

Ms. Sandra Kelly
Program Planner/Coordinator
Snohomish County Youth Work
Experience Program
Everett, Washington

Mr. Harold Rogovin
Assistant Principal
Wilbur Cross High School
New Haven, Connecticut

Mr. James Woodberry
Program Administrator for CETA
Out-of-School Programs
Vocational Education Center
New Haven, Connecticut

Observers

Dr. James J. Hancock
Career Education Coordinator
Jackson, Mississippi

Ms. Mary Schifferli
Bureau of Occupational and
Adult Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief State
School Officers
Washington, D.C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to establish joint goals between LEAs and Prime Sponsors.
2. How to establish good monitoring goals and procedures for YETP.
3. How to translate elements in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement in terms understandable to operating personnel.
4. How to establish academic credit for work experience.
5. Communicating information between LEAs and Prime Sponsors without having it get lost somewhere in the bureaucratic "yum yum tree."
6. How to make counselors become positive, rather than negative, resources for YETP.
7. Can YETP really help reduce the high school dropout rate?
8. How can a local career education plan be used to help make the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement more effective in its delivery?
9. Is the quality of vocational education in LEAs sufficient to attain the goals of YETP?
10. Can LEAs provide the kinds of assessment, employability skills, and practical career counseling needed by YETP youth?
11. How can YETP be used to improve the quality of delivery rather than just "more of the same" in LEAs?
12. How can we improve the quality of work sites for YETP?
13. How to provide suitable training to work site supervisors.
14. How can LEAs be encouraged to provide elementary school career education efforts needed to help make YETP work effectively?
15. How can YETP and LEA financial resources be best combined in these "Proposition 13" times?
16. How to solve the late funding problem.
17. How to improve the quantity and quality of support services available under YETP.
18. How to recognize and provide for the fact that many YETP enrollees are educationally disadvantaged as well as economically disadvantaged.

19. How to get more adequate career observation and career exploration activities for YETP participants.

20. How to make the YETP work experience more meaningful both to YETP and youth and to their work site supervisors.

21. How to help educators give more input to and get more output from LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

22. How can the criticism that YETP encourages welfare participation be overcome?

23. How to use existing academic classes in LEAs in a cross-disciplinary sense as contributors to the YETP effort.

24. How to make a meaningful educational program, including alternative education, for YETP youth from small rural districts.

25. How to get a total community commitment to YETP by modifying Department of Labor rules and regulations (including making new regulations providing for family counseling).

26. How to get a mutual planning process for LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements with sufficient lead time.

27. How to help educators better understand Prime Sponsors and help Prime Sponsors better understand LEAs.

28. How to get definitive and accurate interpretations of YETP rules and regulations where more than one Prime Sponsor exists in a given State.

29. How can the Employment Service be used as a resource for effective delivery of YETP without additional Prime Sponsor funds being required.

30. How to view youth programs in a long-run continuing sense rather than as a short-term temporary effort.

31. How to have YETP funds tied to something better than the adult unemployment rate.

32. How to change the philosophy of YETP toward a long-range developmental effort.

33. How to answer Advisory Council questions regarding the need for putting YETP funds into LEAs to do what Council members thought LEAs were supposed to be doing anyway.

34. How to provide transition services for non-economically disadvantaged as well as for economically disadvantaged youth.

35. How can YETP work best for 14-15 year olds?

36. How to avoid community duplication of effort in solving the youth employability problem.

37. How to maximize LEA use of CETA funds and still stay within the law.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Jama Roman and Jim Beshalske - Toledo, Ohio

Jim B. (Prime Sponsor representative)

The Prime Sponsor in Toledo was elected four years ago to operate NYC and SPEDY itself, not through the LEA as had previously been done. When YETP came in, we found that "work experience" is one thing, but trying to provide education or training within the LEA is something else. We had to find a different way.

We sat down with our three LEAs to see what they needed that would fit within the YETP rules and regulations. In doing this, our LEAs indicated a need to utilize the existing SKILL CENTERS in a more productive fashion through making them available to 9th and 10th graders in addition to their prior use by 11th and 12th graders.

We picked up Section 680.9(c) from YETP regulations which allows "limited transition services" to youth, IRRESPECTIVE OF ECONOMIC STATUS. We are taking advantage of this provision now for 9th and 10th graders. From the Prime Sponsor perspective, the result has been a local program based on local needs.

Jama (LEA representative)

Since 1969, we have had a career education program, K-10. Until last year, it was in only one of our ten high school attendance areas. As part of this program, we developed a nine-week guidance unit for 10th graders that included such things as: (a) GATB, (b) shadowing, (c) Ohio Vocational Information System, etc.

When YETP funds became available, we used this nine-week block to provide "transition services" to students in all 10 Toledo high schools. Our effort was aimed at 14-15 year olds and included awarding 1/4 unit of academic credit for these nine weeks. To do this, we hired 10 people, one for each school. Kids come to this class for nine weeks. Their experiences here include heavy emphasis on assessment, on labor market information, etc. We now have two terminals for the Ohio Vocational Information System operating in two of these 10 high schools (but paid for by LEA funds, NOT by YETP funds).

One of our needs was for a "SKILL CENTER," a system of "add-ons" to traditional vocational education. These are career exploration/simulation centers for a variety of career clusters. Different career clusters are in different buildings, and kids can go from one school to another using our existing Toledo LEA bus system.

This year, we will have served 100 percent of the economically disadvantaged in Toledo schools PLUS 90 percent of the sophomores in the Toledo City Schools. To do this, we are using $90,000 YETP funds supplemented by $60,000 from the general school fund. This $150,000 is serving 3,000 youth.

Because we are looking at YETP from a developmental/preventive perspective, we have placed a heavy emphasis on decision-making.

Jim B.: To try to impress a YETP Advisory Council with the effectiveness of whatever you do with 14-15 year olds (where jobs cannot be the prime evaluative criterion) is sometimes tough.

Jama: Getting 1/4 unit of academic credit has been a big deal for us. It has led us to consider other community alternatives for awarding academic credit -- for example, awarding 1/4 unit academic credit for Junior Achievement.

Questions and Answers

Q - Are you enrolling these YETP kids with the same procedures required for use in the Career Employment Experiences portion of YETP?
A - No. We are not limiting participation to the economically disadvantaged.

Q - How do you get the money to serve ALL kids?
A - We convinced the Prime Sponsor that it was legal, by quoting Section 680.9(c) of the YETP regulations. Further, we can say we ARE serving ALL economically disadvantaged youth in Toledo.

Q - Are all your YETP participants sophomores?
A - Yes, except for some juniors who did not have YETP last year and wanted it.

Q - Are the "skill centers" properly thought of as career exploration/simulation rather than as traditional "vocational education"?
A - No. They are mostly vocational education centers.

Q - Could you serve ALL high school kids through a career exploration system such as you have developed?
A - Yes.

Q - Do you have certified teachers working in your SKILL CENTERS?
A - Yes.

Q - Are the 10 teachers in group guidance all paid for by YETP funds?
A - No. Five and one-third are paid for by YETP and the rest out of the LEA's general fund.

Q - What other things are paid for by the $90,000 YETP dollars you get?
A - Computer terminal time, test scoring, and transportation of students to explore programs in others high schools. We do not use YETP funds to buy hardware; that is why we do not use the funds to buy computer terminals (but we would like to!).

Q - Do you do anything special for YETP-eligible youth that you do not do for all 10th graders?
A - Not this year. Next year, we may.

Ann Hagestad and John Sedey - St. Paul, Minnesota

John (LEA representative)

Ramsey County includes four LEAs; the one I am in serves 14,000 students. We have been involved with Department of Labor youth programs since 1974.

One of the things we use LEA money for is the Minnesota Occupational Information System. We rely heavily on this for self assessment. It is open to youth and to adults during evenings as well as during the school day.

We got into the YETP "experimental 10 percent program" under an experiment that called for a 50 percent share of wages paid to handicapped kids (but not economically disadvantaged) involved in the private sector.

We try to get all four of our LEAs together to plan jointly with our single Prime Sponsor.

We have NOT used YETP funds to pay staff salaries. Our YETP money goes primarily to pay students for work experience.

We try very hard to combine our YETP money with money available from other sources such as vocational education, special education, etc., in a unified effort to help kids.

We have a special program for out-of-school youth leading toward a GED and an experiential learning program leading toward an actual diploma for such youth.

We have not tried to create new YETP courses and then seek academic credit for them. We feel it is better to integrate YETP participants in regular school courses so that we do not stigmatize YETP participants in any way.

We have good career exploration arrangements in operation through relationships with our local Chamber of Commerce. We are also using PROJECT BUSINESS of JUNIOR ACHIEVEMENT.

SPECIAL SKILLS TRAINING - We are part of a consortium of nine LEAs that share a VOCATIONAL CENTER, a special facility serving both secondary school and post-secondary school students with specific training programs, in addition to vocational assessment.

Our greatest problem with YETP was that we created jobs for many kids BUT, after they left us, they did not have many more general employability skills than they had when they came to us. Last summer, we revised our goals so as to make them relate more directly to general employability skills including arrangements for increased use of employers in this effort. We now have a package that puts some obligation on employers to assist us in helping their prospective employees to learn how to get and to hold a job in a realistic fashion.

Ann (Prime Sponsor representative)

We used to use CETA Title I funds for our in-school efforts prior to the time YEDPA was passed. As YETP came along, we were able to fund one "YOUTH COORDINATOR" in each of our four LEAs who, while paid by PSE, is regarded as an LEA employee. These COORDINATORS assess youth needs and refer them to various CETA programs.

Each LEA has a different philosophy on offering academic credit. As a result, there is a range from NO CREDIT to as much as 1/2 CREDIT for YETP experiences.

In YETP, many youth begin at age 14 and stay with the program for three to four years. We find ourselves repeating some of the same job seeking/finding/getting/holding skill information if they stay with the program too long.

We cannot give any one LEA very much money; even so, the LEAs are using YETP as an additional option open to economically disadvantaged youth.

We, the Prime Sponsor, work directly with the four vocational education directors in our LEAs. Each LEA gets limited funds for administrative costs and for paying some of the computer terminal costs.

We are also working with a special school for mentally handicapped youth. During summers, we will have four two-day camps with 100 youth in each going into YSEP where employers will be speaking to youth about their businesses. This worked well last year.

The $2.90 minimum wage is a problem in that it is not enough for older YETP youth and it is too much for our 14-15 year olds participating in YETP.

In making allocations to our four LEAs, we allocate "x" number of hours to each LEA and it, in turn, determines the number of youth it can serve with this allocation. Each LEA makes up its own plan based on the needs of the youth and the types of jobs.

Questions and Answers

Q - Is your summer camp out in the country?
A - The two-day camp is nearby, within our county. In John's LEA, youth are taken to a Northern Minnesota camp for a full week.

Q - Do you pay your YETP youth at these summer camps?
A - In the one-week camp, they are paid, but in the two-day camps they are not. If they want to participate in YSEP, they are required to go through the two-day camps. There, the youth are taught some basic job seeking/getting/holding skills.

Q - Have you been able to co-mingle YETP funds with other kinds of funds?
A - We pay our vocational education instructors 50 percent from State vocational educational funds and 50 percent from general foundation aids. Youth are paid through YETP.

Q - What are you using your YETP funds for?
A - We use them primarily to pay wages to YETP participants. In addition, we pay for computer costs and $2,000 for LEA administrative costs. The four staff positions mentioned earlier are PSE positions and are paid for under PSE funds, not by YETP.

Marilyn Wiltz and Sandra Kelly - Everett, Washington

Sandra (Prime Sponsor representative)

We serve 13 LEAs from our Prime Sponsor office. Because we are a Tier I YIEP location, we have put all our 16-19 year olds in YIEP, saving YETP slots for 14-15 year olds.

The YETP staff persons in each LEA are paid for by YETP. NOTE: We receive a 25 percent administrative cost figure. Staff persons paid for by YETP funds are to devote an average of 2 1/2 hours per week to each YETP participant. They all do intake, career exploration, etc. NOTE: They are all regular LEA employees who are paid to participate in YETP on an "after school" basis. Thus, they know the YETP participants well from having had them in school during the regular school day. The biggest drawback to this arrangement is that, because they work only part-time on YETP, there is sometimes a tendency for YETP activities not to be as important to these LEA persons as we would wish.

We are very strongly involved in encouraging school attendance. Our general rule is that, if a participant is too sick to come to school he/she is too sick to go to YETP-paid work experience. This does encourage school attendance.

Under our YIEP effort, we are becoming very much involved with the private sector.

We find YETP being very well accepted by our LEAs, in part because we have employed LEA persons as YETP staff persons.

Most of our YETP counselors visit job sites at least once every 10 days. This becomes possible because we operate primarily as an after-school program.

Marilyn (LEA representative)

I work for our LEA as a full-time vocational counselor; after school, I am responsible for 50-60 YETP participants.

Many of our YETP participants either are attending or are planning to attend our Vocational Skill Center.

Our high school principal at first denied ACADEMIC CREDIT to our YETP participants on the basis that "they were not working during school time." We made a deal to work with YETP participants 30 minutes per week during the time school was in session if the high school principal would agree to give these youth one academic credit for each 200 hours of YETP work experience. He agreed to do so, provided I, as the YETP counselor, kept careful record of these 200 hours.

I see these kids each week and visit each of them at the job site at least once every other week.

Questions and Answers

Q - Can a kid be employed by the private sector (not YETP) and get credit for after-school work experience?
A - No, because no LEA person is accountable for the kid under such conditions.

Q - Did the principal agree to grant YETP kids academic credit without getting prior approval of your Board of Education?
A - Not really. The same guidelines are used as for the regular in-school work experience kids.

Q - Marilyn, are you a full-time LEA employee?
A - Yes. After school, I work 2 1/2 hours per day for YETP. I do also see my YETP kids, of course, during the school day as part of my regular job.

Q - Exactly what is each of these part-time YETP counselors responsible for?
A - (a) Certifying youth as YETP-eligible (this is checked again by Prime Sponsor persons); (b) completing YETP intake forms; (c) job development; (d) placement of YETP kids on jobs; (e) on-the-job counseling; and (f) monitoring of work sites.

Q - Has your Board of Education committed itself to CETA programs?
A - Yes.

Q - Do you have anything for non-YETP eligible youth in your LEA?
A - No. YETP funds are for YETP-eligible youth only.

Bob Bassard and Harry Holmberg - Los Angeles County, California

Harry (Prime Sponsor representative)

The Los Angeles County Office operates as the LEA for all school districts in the county. Our YETP funds are limited to exactly 22 percent. Our master agreement is with our county government, which represents one of five CETA Prime Sponsors in Los Angeles County.

After we negotiate the LEA/Prime Sponsor master agreement, we have a very simple one-page agreement for each local school district in the county to sign.

The two major components in our YETP effort are: (a) work experience (paid) and (b) transition services (unpaid).

The "transition services" component is limited to two school divisions: (a) one serving incarcerated youth and (b) one serving special education youth.

Our paid YETP "career employment experience" effort operates differently in different local school districts. Two examples include (a) one LEA which has used YETP to create a career ladder for "cream of the crop" YETP-eligible juniors and seniors who, after YETP, are almost sure to find employment; (b) another LEA which operates YETP primarily through its horticulture program.

In the "transition services" component in our special school for incarcerated youth, we have used about $50,000 YETP money for a complete vocational assessment program. After a particular youth has been through this system, he/she is assigned to a "camp for incarcerated youth" where special vocational skill training can be obtained in an area related to individual career goals.

Bob (LEA representative - Hacienda La Puente Unified School District, one LEA in Los Angeles County)

We try to combine use of YETP funds with other funds such as vocational education, adult education, etc., to operate what we call our WORK EVALUATION PROGRAM. This program includes (a) a battery of tests (including GATB, ABLE, WRAT, Ravens, and work samples such as J.E.V.S., Valpar and V.V.C system); (b) intake interviews (including individualized vocational assessment that includes 30-57 hours of work sample simulation exercises); and (c) placement in the Valley Vocational Center.

We have often tested kids who, according to our assessments, should be in one program but who, after knowing this, elect another program. They have a right to do so. It works out okay in that, after a youth has had a chance to try out a particular program, he/she can change, go back through the evaluation process, and select another program.

The END POINT in our WORK EVALUATION PROGRAM is to direct the student toward an area of vocational training related to his/her career choice.

We are also making major use of the ADKINS LIFE CAREER SKILLS PROGRAM. This seems to work well with CETA students in giving them a more positive set of attitudes toward themselves. It involves about 80 to 120 hours of intensive training. It is expensive.

Our final action in the WORK EVALUATION PROGRAM is to place kids in our Employee Development Department (EDD), which is also housed at our Valley Vocational Center.

In our testing/assessment procedures, we develop an individualized contract with each youth regarding his/her career plans.

We have a work experience teacher, a CETA counselor, one adult education teacher for the Adkins Life Skills program, and two adult education teachers on work evaluation involved in our YETP effort. The kids go to EDD six to seven weeks before completing their last courses at the Valley Vocational Center.

We also develop an individual work evaluation contract with each student. Under terms of this contract, if the student does not show up for work, he/she does not get paid.

We have a catalogue of community sites available for use as career exploration training sites.

We have a separate component for some special education kids through an Adult Education sheltered workshop centering in the food training area. We use one of our cafeterias to give these youth some "hands on" experience. Employers are waiting for students from this program, so we can provide immediate placement for those wanting to work.

Questions and Answers

Q - Are only YETP participants in this program?
A - Yes. It is entirely an after-school program, with a maximum of 200 hours. Youth are paid for the time they spend in this YETP program.

Q - Who pays the teachers working in your work evaluation program?
A - The district, not YETP.

Q - How many YETP participants do you handle?
A - 75 at any one time.

Q - Are you doing anything about the sex stereotyping problem?
A - Yes. We have prepared a special booklet, "43 Ways to Overcome Sex Stereotyping."

Harold Rogovin and Jim Woodberry - New Haven, Connecticut

Harold (LEA representative)

New Haven has a population of about 131,000. Eighty percent of the high school students are from welfare families. After five or six generations of "welfare families," most of these youth have no clear career plans. The high schools have a 45 percent dropout rate. Seventy percent of our high school students are minority persons.

CBOs are very active in New Haven. We also have a Community Action Agency that disburses funds to various communities within New Haven. There is a real COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT in our area.

CETA/LEA relationships have been healthy ones for the last several years. Our top CETA administrator and our top LEA school administrator continue to meet about once a week.

Our summer SPEDY program utilizes schools as district offices for SPEDY. During the school year, CETA offices are processing YETP enrollees in each high school. In each high school, we have a "work/study office" staffed by: (a) a YOUTH COORDINATOR, (b) a YOUTH COUNSELOR, (c) two PROGRAM AIDES, and (d) a SECRETARY. This team serves about 100 YETP participants in each high school.

Prior to the summer period, our Prime Sponsor uses the Board of Education's computer to process SPEDY applications and to do payroll.

As of now, we cannot see hard evidence that our YETP effort has reduced our high school dropout rate, BUT we feel that, within a few years, we will be able to do so.

Our prime emphasis has been on: (a) academic credit and (b) transition services. In terms of ACADEMIC CREDIT we have developed a plan for awarding it based on competencies YETP youth acquire, NOT on the basis of simply noting they are enrolled in YETP. Some experiences will get more academic credit than others, depending on the competencies acquired. This system can be applied to all of our LEA programs and is, in no way, intended to be limited in use to YETP.

We are working on developing a CAREER PLANNING PROFILE for each 8th grader. This will be used for all students, YETP and non-YETP alike. It will follow the youth through her/his entire school experience. In the case of YETP participants, this plan is to be reviewed jointly, on an annual basis, by the regular in-school counselor and the CETA counselor.

Other CETA-related activities in which we are involved include: (a) a program of BASIC SKILLS FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION funded by CETA for 90 students who are potential high school dropouts; (b) a special three-cycle clerical training program for high school seniors. The clerical training program includes: (1) a six-week summer program prior to beginning the senior year; (2) an in-school program of 13 hours per week; and (3) 10 hours of training coupled with 15 hours of work experience per week for six weeks in a business school. This is strictly for YETP participants.

Jim W. (Prime Sponsor representative)

I was asked, as a CETA person, to evaluate all in-school work experience programs. One of the things I discovered is that, while top management of both CETA and the LEA agree with each other, the line operators do not understand what is in the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. Many of them, in fact, have not even seen it!

We acted, as a result, to establish a CETA/LEA COMMITTEE whose purpose, in part, was to explain the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement to school personnel and to start joint planning between LEA and Prime Sponsor personnel on how to make this LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement really work well. We have, in addition, used this CETA/LEA COMMITTEE to monitor existing CETA programs and to begin other kinds of CETA programs. One of our new programs is a YOUTH-OPERATED PLACEMENT PROGRAM.

We felt a need for CETA and LEA persons to better understand each other. We have now revamped our CETA operations in LEAs to move from a pattern that employs para-professionals to one that calls for employing persons with college degrees.

We have several other kinds of agreements that have been "spin-offs" from our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. Every program we run has guidelines and written agreements spelling out exact roles and functions for all persons and positions involved. It has made for a very positive turnabout in terms of how both the CETA and the LEA persons do business with one another. We now do a very great deal of planning together. Monthly meetings are held between LEAs and Prime Sponsor representatives. In addition to joint planning, we also do a lot of joint writing of documents explaining our LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships and programs.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you have only one Prime Sponsor and one LEA in New Haven?

A - Yes.

Q - Why are so many of your kids from welfare families?
A - It is the general employment picture. Unemployment for adults is around 15 percent in the minority community.

Q - Do you have a high mobility rate?
A - It is not as tough now as it was a few years ago.

Q - Do you have trouble with your State Department of Education in awarding credit for work experience not directly connected with the LEA?
A - No. One criterion for judging whether we will ask for academic credit for any work experience program is the extent to which it is related to the academic program of the student.

Q - Do top administrators in the Prime Sponsor and the LEA offices have to sign off on documents written by and agreed to by local operating persons from the Prime Sponsor and LEA office operations?
A - Yes.

THREE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to improve the quantity and quality of support services available under YETP.
- How to provide transition services for non-economically disadvantaged as well as for economically disadvantaged youth.
- How can we improve the quality of work sites for YETP?

Issue: How to improve the quantity and quality of support services available under YETP

Marilyn: One example was a young man whose dad is disabled. This young man had never been to a dentist. One day, he said he had a toothache. When I looked in his mouth, every tooth looked bad. Our CETA program agent authorized $200 for a dental exam, BUT the dentist's estimate to fix his teeth was $800. CETA could not pay it. I finally found money from other sources such as (a) the Haas Foundation, (b) a local memorial fund, and (c) our school health fund. This whole effort took about a month. The young man's mother told me they were not eligible for any other health benefits because they are not quite poor enough.

Another young man in our work study special education department was dirty and unshaven; he had no clothes that were even clean, let alone neat. He looked terrible. We had no YETP funds for use in providing him with the kind of clothes he needed to go out and apply for a job.

A girl in YETP came to me seeking eye glasses. She did not want the kind of eye glasses that the local welfare office supplies.

Maybe we should make a new YETP regulation that says when any youth enters into YETP, he/she should be given a physical exam, an eye exam, and a dental exam as a routine measure, part of the intake procedure.

Sandy: We find our local Department of Health Services and our Social Security offices are not very cooperative in helping youth below age 18 (when they become legal adults). One of our foster daughters, whom we got at age 16, had needed special corrective shoes since she was nine, but other foster parents have been unable to get them paid for.

The quality of medical, dental, and optical care available to these youth is much in need of improvement.

Jama: In Toledo, the Junior League has become very interested in foster home care. We have also developed a large child advocacy constituency in Toledo that is providing needy youth with still more help.

John: It is not that community resources are not available but, rather, that lots of people do not know where to find them. We had "YOUTH SERVICE AGENCIES" established in various parts of our area a few years ago whose prime purpose was to refer persons to needed resources. Unfortunately, some of these have become service agencies themselves and so have lost their ability to fill this needed referral role.

Another thing we have done is to establish a COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTER in one of our empty schools. Run by the LEA, this center houses multiple kinds of county services which, because we are using empty elementary schools, makes such services available to people, youth and adults alike, on almost a "neighborhood" basis.

Jim W.: We have had a lot of these same problems. We have drawn on Title 19 of some HEW health law. There has been a strong community collaborative effort to develop community health centers available to anyone in the community. UNITED WAY supplies part of its funding. We are using the COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS for meeting the medical, dental, and optical needs of YETP youth. We have also developed a COMMUNITY HUMAN SERVICES MANUAL under Title 19 in which all kinds of community resources are listed.

Bob: I do not think YETP funds should be spent for these kinds of supportive services. Other sources are available. For example, we can get eye glasses for youth from our local Lion's Club.

Marilyn: DISAGREE: The groups like Lions Clubs should be providing for non-YETP eligible youth, but YETP funds should be for YETP youth support services needs.

Jim B.: AGREE WITH BOB. To use YETP funds for total needed social services is missing its basic intent. We should be able to use existing community services.

We have Title 19 and Title 20 funds from our State Department of Social Services. They come through Social Welfare Services. Section 680.11 of the YETP regulations makes YETP income exempt from being counted as "income." BUT, Title 19 says we should count everything as "income." So far, we have contended the YETP regulations prevail over Title 19, and nobody has questioned us on this yet.

Sandy: Our Department of Health Services does not want to provide services to YETP-eligible youth whose families are not, under HEW rules, eligible for health coupons.

In rural counties, there are not a lot of community resources. Thus, we do spend some of our YETP support money to meet some of these health needs. We are getting some criticism for doing so. As a Prime Sponsor employee, I feel I should try to find non-YETP funds for support when they are obviously badly needed.

Bob: DISAGREE. We can use YETP funds in better ways than for support services and health services.

Harry: We use our "support services" funds for things like transportation, counselor aids, etc. BUT we use other community resources for health services.

Marilyn: What about things like needed clothes?

Bob: We find that poverty kids who really want a job come through looking okay when we require them to do so.

Jama: In Toledo, we have the "OLD NEWSBOYS CLUB." Members devote major efforts to providing shoes to kids who do not have them. There are many community resources that have not been tapped by school agencies. These groups can help with many of the "support services" and special needs of these youth.

John: We have to look at this student's "barriers to employment." IF lack of clothes is one of those barriers, then getting such clothes is a legitimate use of YETP money.

Bob: A community collaborative effort is needed. We use: (a) churches, (b) state rehabilitation services, (c) United Way, (d) local service clubs, (e) county health programs, and (f) our school nurse program to link together in order to meet many of the supportive service needs of YETP youth. By doing so, we can reserve more of our YETP funds for use in paying for work experience for YETP youth.

Issue: How to provide transition services for non-economically disadvantaged as well as for economically disadvantaged youth

Jama: We are doing this. At the Great Cities Schools Council, we were told that what we are doing is legal, but immoral. My feeling is that non-economically disadvantaged youth may get in that category shortly after they leave high school if we do not help them acquire the kinds of general employability skills possible to provide under YETP "transition services."

John: In our day-to-day operations, we do not even know if a student is economically disadvantaged or not. We try to integrate ALL students -- in part, to avoid the "separate but equal" danger of the past.

Sandra: Everything we pay is ALWAYS just for economically disadvantaged youth. We do not mix YETP funds with other non-Department of Labor funds. The LEAs make the computer terminals available to all students during the year (using their own funds) and we pay for computer use during the summer for SPEDY youth only.

Jim B.: We have considered that, so long as we are not paying the youth either a wage or an allowance, we are justified in serving non-disadvantaged as well as YETP-eligible youth. We are thinking of putting in a special program for disadvantaged youth only that would provide them with more intensive help during the summer, but we are not sure this is a good idea.

Jama: Our assistant superintendent is very opposed to administering a program that pays kids wages or allowances. CETA took over the Title I and SPEDY programs from our LEA three years ago and, because CETA does not have to follow teacher union rules on salaries, it can run these programs more cheaply than can the LEA -- and, incidentally, still hire the same persons as teachers.

John: We may have an artificial issue here. Maybe we are just talking about an item that reflects biases and personal prejudices of individual Prime Sponsors.

Harry: We tell LEA's "here is some money for support services; use it in ways that seem best to you."

Bob: We have the career center concept where work experience is available to ALL students. It is tough to tell some kids "we cannot pay you $2.90 per hour like we pay the YETP participants." Other than the money, the programs are very similar in nature. It takes more effort to find work experience slots that pay $2.90 per hour. The work evaluation component, at present, is open in our operations only to YETP participants and, even to them, only on an after-school basis. We can get them there because we pay them. We would like to have this for all 8th graders. But, in thinking about 10,000-plus students, we would have to make it part of the school day, not an after-school thing as we now do in YETP. We have Driver Education in our school now for nine weeks out of the 18-week semester, and kids are not expected to show up for that period during the other nine weeks. We are thinking of using the other nine weeks to put in the career education unit for all kids that we now supply to our YETP participants on an after-school basis.

Jama: That is exactly where we got our nine-week unit on career decisionmaking -- i.e., it was left over after kids had completed nine weeks of Driver Education.

Bob: If we do not get this nine-week unit put in and make it a part of our curriculum, we may soon lose several of our good work experience teachers. There are many ways to justify it, but a commitment is the only saving grace.

Harold: Youth in general are still going out into the labor market unprepared for making the school-to-work transition. We *can* justify giving non-economically disadvantaged the general employability skills of YETP "transition services."

Sandra: Even though our program is limited to economically disadvantaged youth, we can include juvenile justice kids and handicapped kids. I can think of two brothers, one in juvenile trouble and the other not. We gave much attention to the one in trouble and nothing to the other. In about a year, the one not in trouble figured out that the way to get special attention was to get in trouble!

Marilyn: I see lots of kids who have figured out that, to get real help, they should arrange to be poor. No matter how high you go in the "lower income figure," there will be some who were not *quite* "poor enough." The only solution will be to make this general employability skill training available to all kids.

Harry: DISAGREE. In Los Angeles 36 percent of minority kids are unemployed. We have only so many dollars available. The minority inner city kids *are* lost if they do not get help. I can justify using our money for these kids.

Bob: The training we need to provide is primarily attitudinal. When we give something to youth, we should also *expect* something from them. They should at least come to work on time, do their best, etc. -- *i.e.*, demonstrate these general employability skills.

Jama: Do you have any kind of career education in your elementary schools yet.

Bob: No, but we are in the process of implementing it next year.

Harold: We have got to recognize the need to begin in kindergarten. Age 14 is far too late.

John: One of the hopeful signs is that the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements are getting smaller -- *i.e.*, we are moving towards an "assurance" approach rather than having every detail spelled out in the contract. The more detail we put in the contract, the less time and discretion you have to really help kids. We can quantify our services to meet Department of Labor requirements even with a simple "assurances" contract.

Harry: AGREE. The size of Los Angeles County makes it impossible to be highly specific with local schools, BUT we can and do maintain overall accountability for the county as a whole.

Jim W.: YETP money should not be used for all kids. Disadvantaged kids need a break of some kind in order to get a shot at success. If some non-disadvantaged kids are angry because disadvantaged kids are getting some special help, then there is something wrong with the basic attitudes in the total school.

Marilyn: AGREE. I do not think a kid whose parents make $30,000 per year should have the same chance at YETP work experience as poor kids who really need a job and work experience just to stay in school. The thing I object to is the LEVEL OF FAMILY INCOME. Without considering the extent to which the parents use some of their money to help their children, this can be misleading. It would be better if we could look at the individual student, not just at gross family income.

Jim W.: We know in New Haven that we do not have enough money to serve anywhere near all the really poor kids. We do not need some special kind of refined measure to figure out who needs help the most!

John: I think the YETP law is very reasonable when it says: (a) transition services providing general employability skills can be used for ALL youth; BUT (b) work experience (with pay) ought to be limited to economically disadvantaged.

NOTE: GENERAL CONSENSUS ON THIS POINT.

Sandy: I have been offered 300 jobs in the private sector this summer, but I have enough PSE jobs so that I do not need them. I am not interested in private sector unsubsidized jobs because: (a) the private sector wants to "cream" our kids, taking only those I could place anyway;

and (b) if we (CETA) pay the kid's salary, we have much more control over work site supervision and so can get the kid higher quality work experience.

Issue: How can we improve the quality of work sites for YETP?

Harry: I am concerned primarily with work sites themselves. The fact that we are locked out of the private sector bothers me. A related problem is what happens at the work site. Because our kids are disadvantaged (their parents make frequent use of PSE agencies), they see on the PSE work site only that part of the world of work with which they are already familiar. They STILL do not get to see the world of work in the private sector that neither they nor their parents know very much about. The result is simply to lock the kid into the PSE portion of society.

Jama: If YETP youth worked two to three days per week in PSE-type jobs (like cleaning the school), maybe we could put them out in career exploration in the private sector for the other two or three days in the week, or even for only one day per week.

Bob: The private sector resists kids coming out to "observe" who are not going to be productive for the employer.

Jim W.: This year, we have tried to develop PSE jobs that are not dead-end and are related to the career goals of the youth. These are the two criteria I use in judging whether or not I have a "good" work site.

Sandy: Portland has a beautiful three-day career exploration experience in the private sector that begins with an in-school preparation phase. We are doing some private sector development (with the 10 percent of YIEP funds and 10 percent of SPEDY funds available for use in private sector), BUT there are problems in the private sector involving: (a) complaints of organized labor; (b) complaints by employers whose competitors got some "free help"; and (c) criticism that some of these kids are in jobs that, in fact, would never be created if it were not for the YETP dollars.

Jim B.: DISAGREE. There is nothing mandatory about a 10 percent private sector involvement in SPEDY. You may do a VEP if you want to, but it is not mandatory.

Jim W.: Our primary problem is that the private sector frowns on taking kids for employment for only two hours per day.

Harry: We have had a "CETA GOES TO COLLEGE" program during the summer for the last 10 years. Under this program, the LEAs select 35 youth (mostly seniors) to go to a community college during the summer. The college sets up a two-hour class (for which kids do not get paid) aimed at helping these kids get ready to enter college. Then the kids spend two hours each day working on the campus in some really good spots -- for example, the computer center, the Business Office, or the President's Office. By the end of the summer, each kid has three units of community college credits PLUS this work experience. It is part of our SYEP program. Work experience slots are assigned based on each kid's career goals. Kids are there from 8:00 - 4:30 each day.

Bob: In the class, participants also get special help in registering for college classes in the fall and for all matriculation processes.

Harry: Over 80 percent of these kids have gone on to get four-year college degrees. The only "extra" costs (above what would go for work experience salaries anyway) are in transporting these kids to the campus. Those costs amount to about $5,000.

Bob: We need to do something about improving our work site supervisors. They need (a) knowledge of the YETP goals for youth; and (b) training in how to be a supervisor of students. It is unrealistic to expert supervisors to work with unknown standards.

Sandra: There are several limitations from the Department of Labor regarding the kinds of jobs we can get for 14-15 year olds. These kids are not wanted in the private sector. It is paying off for us now in that, during the school year, we arrange their work experience on almost a 1:1 basis in places like the school library, the school custodial service, our local Employment Service office and school offices. We cannot put these 14-15 year olds in any kind of machine work. We find we are able to emphasize general employability skills with them but not specific vocational skill training.

Harold: I have heard time and time again that jobs like "custodial work" are bad jobs.

Sandy: It depends on the custodian who serves as the site supervisor.

Bob: DISAGREE. The work experience of any kid should be related to his/her tentative career goals. It is a cop-out to simply talk about "general employability skills." In our program, we put our 14-15 year olds in work experiences related to their expressed career interests. We are fortunate to be a big district in which a wide variety of kinds of work experience slots exist.

Sandy: It is okay to "relate work experience to career goals of 14-15 year olds," BUT it works only when their career goals are consistent with the narrow range of careers in which the Department of Labor says 14-15 year olds can participate. We tell our 14-15 year olds that the most important thing they have to learn is good work habits.

Jama: BUT that is what CETA is currently being criticized for -- putting kids into "meaningful jobs."

What is a meaningful job?

Sandy: One the kid likes and from which he is learning.

Bob: A job that has some carry-over value to immediate or long-range career decisions.

Harold: With some kids, no job will be meaningful. We have to change attitudes first.

Harry: We had a discussion with kids about "quality work sites." Some kids think they should be paid more than other kids. We need to help youth see relationships between various kinds of work and the values of ALL kinds of work. It is frustrating for kids to stay in CETA from age 14 through age 18 without ever getting a raise. NOTE: THERE IS NO LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF HOURS A YOUTH CAN WORK IN THE IN-SCHOOL PROGRAM. (Our Prime Sponsor limits us to 200 hours per participant in the summer.)

Jama: I am concerned about the quality of work site supervision. Too many kids are not being kept busy. That is *one* criterion for use in judging "quality of work sites" -- *i.e.*, IS THE KID BEING KEPT BUSY?

John: One of the problems is that many of our work site supervisors are not used to being an "employer" and thus cannot establish a good "employer/employee relationship" with the youth. This is a criterion that could be used in judging "quality of work sites": HAVE SUPERVISORS LEARNED THIS SKILL?

Harry: In reality, where few work sites are available, we tend not to pull youth out of them, even when the sites are bad. This leaves us with no alternative but to try to improve the quality of work site supervision.

Bob: The work site supervisor needs to be trained in things like: (a) how to interview applicants for a job; (b) how to supervise an employee; (c) how to help employees learn on the job; and (d) how to show the employee why the job is important.

We also have to get across to work site supervisors the feeling that we care about *them*.

Jim B.: We could train work site supervisors with our SPEDY start-up money.

Sandy: The problem would be getting them released to take the training.

John W.: When a kid comes in to us for YETP, we do intake interviews, get three career interests, and then look in our "JOB TUB" to see if we have a job that will match. If we cannot find one, we go out and *develop* a job for that youth. We get a commitment from the agency to train the kid. We use a "JOB ANALYSIS REPORT FORM" and monitor the experience. In effect, the work site supervisor is trained, in an OJT manner, through this monitoring function we perform.

Harold: Some of the work site supervisors are not trainable.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 130
Academic Credit for Transition Services
May 8 and 9, 1979

Participants

Ms. Trudy Chenell McNulty
Assistant Superintendent
of Schools
South Portland School
District
South Portland, Maine

Ms. Frances Rosen
Career Education Coordinator
Sacramento City Unified School
District
Sacramento, California

Ms. Esther Korin
Coordinator of Career Internship
Programs
Rockland County BOCES
West Nyack, New York

Mr. James Hensley
Coordinator of Career Education
Edinburg School District
Edinburg, Texas

Mr. Michael Druley
Project Director
Clinton County YETP Program
Frankfort, Indiana

Mr. John Fitzsimmons
Youth Coordinator
Cumberland County CETA
Portland, Maine

Mr. Gary Wilkening
Chief of Planning and Research
Mr. Harlan Edmonds
CETA Planner
Sacramento/Yolo CETA
Sacramento, California

Mr. Lawrence Growney
Assistant Director
Rockland County Manpower
New City, New York

Ms. Ana Maria Huerta
Youth Services Division Director
County of Hidalgo
Department of Community Affairs
Edinburg, Texas

Ms. Kay Hoff
Program Coordinator for State
Board Technical Education/CETA
Indianapolis, Indiana

Observers

Mr. James Athen, Director
Career Education Division
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

Ms. Mavis Kelly
Chief Manager of Federal Programs
Des Moines, Iowa

Ms. Anne Radford
National Association of State
Boards of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Brady Fletcher
InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.
Rosslyn, Virginia

Ms. Joan Jones
Program Assistant
National Center for Research
and Vocational Education
Columbus, Ohio

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to help CETA and LEA persons understand each other's priorities.

2. How to solve differences in lead times involved in CETA and LEA operations.

3. How to identify and recruit YETP-eligible youth.

4. How to solve problems growing out of the requirement for 22 percent of YETP funds going to LEAs when many needy youth are not in schools.

5. How to solve the language barrier between CETA and LEAs.

6. How to resolve CETA concerns for the disadvantaged with LEA concerns for all youth.

7. How to tie YETP efforts with P.L. 94-142 efforts.

8. How to solve turf problems that prevent serving youth.

9. How to get over distrust of Federal programs growing out of past experiences of reimbursement from the Department of Labor to LEAs.

10. How to involve the private sector in YETP.

11. How to better tie YETP with Title VII of CETA.

12. How to build YETP/career education working relationships when career education efforts are so minimal.

13. How to help counselors acquire a commitment and an expertise in helping economically disadvantaged youth.

14. How to help LEAs and Prime Sponsors better understand and appreciate each other.

15. How to help Prime Sponsors see and use career education as a linking vehicle for YETP.

16. How to coordinate Prime Sponsor/LEA relationships over a number of LEAs which are dealing with the same Prime Sponsor.

17. How to combine various sources of Federal funding in ways that maximize services to youth.

18. How to adapt existing career education programs for use in YETP.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Fran Rosen and Gary Wilkening - Sacramento, California

Gary (Prime Sponsor representative)

Sacramento County has organized a "CETA PROGRAM OPERATORS ASSOCIATION." The LEAs are members of this association along with the CBOs. We, the CETA representatives, meet regularly with this association and discuss problems and plans with them. As a result, when we (CETA) go to our CETA Advisory Council Meetings with proposals, there are no problems presented that our sub-contractors do not know about.

In addition to meeting with LEAs as part of this Association, we (CETA) also meet our LEAs separately in the consortium they have formed. The LEA consortium meets once a month with us. We discuss things such as staffing problems. As a result, we have a very close and good cooperative relationship existing between our CBOs and our LEAs. They trust each other and work together. CETA governing boards need to see that this happens more often. Otherwise, too many CETA funding decisions will be made on a strictly political basis.

Fran (LEA representative)

At the LEA level, the consortium of school districts came into being in order to bring about a greater involvement in planning. About 30 schools are now involved. Operationally, we file one consortium response to the Prime Sponsor's RFP but make separate contracts for implementation, depending on the LEA structure.

My job description calls for me to handle CETA, plus our work experience programs (exploratory work experience, general work experience, and vocational work experience), plus our Regional Occupation Program (ROP).

I was able to handle the problem of giving credit for YETP work experience by simply relating it to our already established school district policy for granting credit for various kinds of work experience.

We make an individual agreement with each YETP youth co-signed by both the LEA and the employer. The agreement covers all the things the youth is to do at the work site.

At each school site, we have a CAREER INFORMATION CENTER staffed by a work experience specialist, an ROP vocational counselor, a paraprofessional, and a clerk. These are jointly funded by District CETA and ROP funds.

The LEAs in our consortium meet monthly. One CBO that serves out-of-school youth is also invited. As members of the PROGRAM OPERATORS ASSOCIATION, we have many chances to work with CBOs. Recently, we used our consortium of LEAs to do joint planning for vocational education.

We operate one comprehensive, coordinated CETA program in our LEA through funding under titles IV, II-B and SYEP.

We are utilizing the new legislation that provides tax breaks for employers to move kids from subsidized to unsubsidized jobs without losing academic credit for the work experience they are acquiring.

We have 80 special needs students in work experience now with CETA help.

At the LEA level, there is no real distinction made between the YETP and the regular work experience student. You cannot tell them apart by looking at them or observing what they do.

Transition services we seek to provide under YETP include: (a) employment counseling, (b) assessment, (c) job finding/retention skills, (d) remedial education, (e) referral services, and (f) job development. In addition, of course, we have our work experience effort.

Questions and Answers

Q - Of the credits you offer, how many are for transition services?

A - It is hard to say, since transition services are not separated out. Instead, we say "X" number of hours on the job coupled with "related training" leads to "Y" number of academic credits.

Q - How long have you been in existence under the arrangements you described here?

A - Since October 1, 1978.

Q - How do you use SPEDY -- linked with II-B or with YETP?

A - We do differentiate, of course, in terms of eligibility for these various programs. With our summer program, we are looking at: (a) 14-15 year old youth and (b) non-vocational education students. With our "transition services" program, we are looking primarily at older youth in vocational education who are getting ready to go out and find a job.

Q - Tell us about the vocational education money you use for inservice training.

A - Since the same persons are handling work experience under YETP and in our regular work experience programs, when we used our vocational education money to help them do work experience better, our YETP effort was improved. There is inevitable spill-over here.

Q - What is the difference between "vocational work experience" and "general work experience"?

A - "Vocational work experience" is for youth in vocational education programs who are preparing for a specific occupation. "General work experience" is for any youth who needs a job in order to stay in school and includes many youth who, in terms of career choices, are still undecided.

Q - How does your PROGRAM OPERATORS ASSOCIATION work?

A - The Prime Sponsor pays the $10 membership fee for each LEA and CBO (out of its administrative budget). There is a monthly meeting that generally lasts about three hours. It is almost like "self in-service education." The Prime Sponsor representatives are invited and do attend these monthly meetings. The meetings are a good way for the Prime Sponsor to communicate with both CBOs and LEAs. There is a lot of peer pressure on CBOs to participate. If they do not participate in this association, it is possible they may not participate much longer in CETA.

Q - I note that you have already budgeted for your LEA YETP effort for next year. Have you done so with money already provided to you by your Prime Sponsor?

A - No. No money has come down yet, BUT we are sure it is going to. That is why we budgeted for it.

Ana Maria Huerta and Jim Hensley - Edinburg, Texas

Ana Maria (Prime Sponsor representative)

As Director of Youth Services Division (CHDCA), I am responsible for planning and implementing all Federal youth programs. I have had extensive experience in dealing with LEAs and with various kinds of Federal programs.

When the YETP guidelines came out in November, 1977, we (CHDCA) started developing linkages with the LEAs; we started our YETP effort in January, 1978. We established a youth advisory council composed of educators, CBOs, business persons, SESAs, and youth representatives. Without the good cooperation from our LEAs, we could not have done it.

Our consortium area covers two counties, and it includes 17 LEAs. Since YETP's inception we have worked out 13 LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements to carry out program efforts. In addition to YETP, we have been able to extend agreements to cover both our in-school CETA II-B program and SYEP. We have sub-contracted the classroom training to LEAs.

In 1978, we provided our YETP participants, seventh, eighth, and ninth graders, with work experience and transitional services (tutorial services in English, math, and reading). We extended the work experience training into the summer in order to provide a more rounded type of training. Participants showed progress in their academic courses, and their grades went up.

In our consortium area, the work experience component is administered by the Prime Sponsor; it is not subcontracted to LEAs or CBOs. We subcontract with LEAs for: (a) classroom training and (b) career exploration. Our work experience component in YETP has been very successful, partly because we work only with LEAs in recruiting youth -- and thus help youth to see that our goal is that they remain in high school until graduation. We place YETP youth in public service agencies that provide them with meaningful job training.

For out-of-school youth, we had a GED/vocational skills training component that includes training in: (a) auto mechanics, (b) auto body, (c) bookkeeping, (d) business skills, and (e) medical secretary.

We were able to transition our in-school YETP participants into the SYEP (Summer Youth Employment Program) and, as a result, prevented some of our youth from moving north for the summer to become migrant workers.

Of our 17 LEAs, we have 12 giving "local" academic credit. Only YETP youth enrolled in cooperative education programs will receive academic credit (i.e., credit counting towards high school graduation).

We have a non-financial agreement with our LEAs. The Prime Sponsor's youth counselors provide "Career Awareness" training to youth. We have eight youth counselors, under the Prime Sponsor's Youth Services Division staff, who work with youth in the LEA setting and at their work sites. These "Youth Counselors" serve as liaison persons for all CETA youth programs. They relate, in the LEA, with persons such as superintendents, vocational educators, principals, instructors, and counselors.

We have a Youth Advisory Council (YAC) that serves as a planning board for youth programs; the responsibility of Council members is to set up guidelines for RFPs, to review and approve youth proposals, and to make recommendations to the Planning Advisory Council (PAC) on proposals approved.

The Texas Employment Commission (SESA) has the responsibility of certifying youth as YETP-eligible.

Last summer, of 194 youth enrolled, 184 received "local" academic credit. This year (1979), we will have about 250 youth who will receive either "local" or "state" academic credit this summer under SYEP.

We provide the following transition services to all participating youth: (a) counseling, (b) assessment, (c) career awareness training (LMO), (d) tutoring, (e) referral/supportive services, (f) job development/placement. These transition services are in addition to the work experience and classroom training efforts.

Jim (LEA representative)

In our YETP effort, Prime Sponsor representatives supervise counseling, job placements, and work site experiences.

Seventy-five to eighty-five percent of our students are economically disadvantaged. Many had trouble being placed in unsubsidized jobs in our regular cooperative vocational education program in the LEA. We turned to our Prime Sponsor to help place these "hard to place" youth.

The Department of Labor came in two years ago and asked us to give academic credit to YETP youth. We did have some YETP kids enrolled in our regular cooperative vocational education program (in which academic credit is no problem). We were able to get 110 YETP slots for use in our regular cooperative vocational education program. In addition to providing academic credit, the program provided further benefit by allowing YETP youth to mix with other cooperative vocational education students.

Our Youth Advisory Council became concerned about providing meaningful work experience. Thus, in our summer program, we will give youth 300 hours of pre-employment training followed by either subsidized or unsubsidized work experience. Next year, in Edinburg alone, we will have 300 Vocational Cooperative students in work experience, compared to 100 only seven years ago.

Questions and Answers

Q - Who runs the career exploration program in the summer?
A - LEAs wrote the proposals and they run it. This program, however, includes one hour of counseling per week for each enrollee, provided by the Prime Sponsor counselor.

Q - What does the "career awareness training" for your in-school program consist of?
A - It provides the youth with labor market information, how to write a job resume, how to participate in a job interview, technical school offerings, etc. We bring in public speakers and films for these youth. Remember, this is an after-school activity, performed as one hour of their 10 weekly hours of work experience.

Q - Did you have any difficulty convincing LEAs that youth counselors of CETA would not take jobs away from regular school counselors?
A - No. We need all the help we can get.

Q - What is the problem in "academic" versus "elective" credit?
A - If we can put the YETP youth in our regular cooperative vocational education program, they get "academic" credit counting toward high school graduation. On the other hand, if they are not enrolled in this regular program, it is called "elective" credit and does not count toward high school graduation, in spite of the fact it is the same instructors, the same equipment, and the same kinds of experiences.

Esther Korin and Larry Growney - Rockland County, New York

Larry (Prime Sponsor representative)

When we started in late 1977, we set up 12 LEA orientation sessions to get a fast start. We let a total of 13 contracts, which included participation of eight of the nine LEAs in our Prime Sponsor area.

Esther (LEA representative)

The INDUSTRY-LABOR COUNCIL is one of a statewide network of work/education councils. It was organized by our BOCES in cooperation with the Rockland County Association, our local version of a Chamber of Commerce.

Prior to last summer, we approached the Manpower people and suggested a one week career development workshop as a culminating "transition service" for summer YETP youth. Workshop components included:

- Staff (in addition to the program supervisor) - PEER LEADERS (college students majoring in social sciences); guidance counselors; and community resource persons

- A pre/post questionnaire designed to measure value of the program and employability skills, which each participant completed.

- Self assessment - self improvement

- Close working relationships with local industry persons who served as good role models for participants.

Our INDUSTRY-EDUCATION-LABOR COUNCIL provided us with a neutral forum for various kinds of community groups in their efforts to join forces to better serve youth.

Larry (Prime Sponsor representative)

For out-of-school youth, we established the CAREER TRAINING AND YOUTH EMPLOYMENT IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM. Designed for 35 unemployed high school dropouts, this program coupled some preliminary class work with summer jobs as part-time security guards at the local community college. In the fall, these participants took eight courses at the community college along with their work experience. A typical week included 12 hours of classes, eight hours of remedial skills training, and one hour of counseling. By the end of the program, participants had earned 24 hours of academic credit. ALL of these youth acquired a high school diploma; they could, if they chose to, continue at the community college until they earned an A.A. degree. There was a full-time YETP placement specialist at the community college to help those who were interested in finding full-time employment at the conclusion of the program.

Our Youth Employment In School (YES) Program is an orientation to the world of work coupled with provision of adaptability skills. YES operates at the high school level in a fashion very much like YIEP. Participants receive three academic credits for their 15 hours of weekly work experience.

Of seven LEAs participating in other YETP efforts, two (in addition to the school where the YES program operated) gave academic credit.

Questions and Answers

Q - Tell us about your career internship program.
A - For students in Grades 7-12, it is a special opportunity over and beyond their regular school program. Participants can get 1/2 unit of academic credit for 60 hours of career exploration involving unpaid work. Each youth has an individual learning contract in this program. It is a model that could work very well for any segment of the student population, including YETP youth. It is definitely NOT something that applies only to the college-bound youth.

Q - Do you have evaluative tools that you are using in connection with your career development week?
A - Yes, a pre/post questionnaire.

Mike Druley and Kay Hoff - Indianapolis, Indiana

Kay (Prime Sponsor representative)

Indiana decided to split its YETP Balance of State funds by giving a portion to the Career Education Section of the State Department of Public

Instruction. (NOTE: Since 1965, the Department of Vocational Education has been reporting to the State Board for Vocational/Technical Education instead of to the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction.)

We took the academic credit question to our State Board for Vocational Education and came up with a plan for awarding academic credit for YETP through LEAs. For the 68 counties included in Indiana's Balance of State, we had 230 LEAs with overlapping vocational education districts. Using this population, we issued RFPs and now have 15 contracts in operation for YETP.

There are three representatives in our office to provide technical assistance to LEAs in grant writing. Each LEA decides for itself, within the regulations of the Department of Public Instruction on academic credit, how, and how much, academic credit it will provide under YETP.

Our biggest success has been in incorporating YETP with existing vocational education programs. YETP directors know the vocational education rules which they must follow if they want academic credit. We have had better success selling YETP to vocational educators than to academic educators.

The LEAs which are not in a vocational education service district have been slower to get started with any kind of YETP effort.

Mike (LEA representative)

As a full-time school counselor, anything I do in YETP is after school. Advantages I have include: (a) previous experience in operating SPEDY and NYC programs and (b) as the counselor, I know the kids in YETP. In addition, I am the schedule-maker for all 1,100 kids in our LEA, which gives me some flexibility. I have the freedom to do what needs to be done.

Our YETP students must attend related classes twice a week (run by a teacher of cooperative office education). YETP is, in effect, a seventh vocational education program added to the six which previously existed in our school. Teachers in the YETP program must be certified as vocational education teachers. Our YETP youth can get two credits for work experience and one credit for classwork.

I have found YETP especially good for special education kids. P.L. 94-142 is going to require more mainstreaming, and this is one way of doing it. For example, we had a girl in special education whose father had left and whose mother had died, leaving her in a bad living environment. She was emotionally insecure and quite withdrawn. We placed her in a teacher aide situation to work with a teacher responsible for retarded pre-school kids. It has been really good for her.

We are going to have to learn much more about how to help economically disadvantaged youth.

Questions and Answers

Q - Why did you, Mike, think about giving up on your participation in YETP?
A - Because of the problems involved, such as two kids who, after I placed them in the private sector, quit YETP but kept their private sector jobs, thus taking away two of the limited job slots available to me for use in YETP.

Q - How many counselors are there in your LEA?
A - Three. I am not supposed to work on YETP during the school day; but, because YETP youth are in school, I can, and do, visit with each student once a week during the school day.

Q - Of the 10 credits awarded for work experience, are all of them vocational education credits?
A - Yes.

Q - Do you have a maximum number of credits any kid can earn through vocational education?
A - Theoretically, if they start as 10th graders, they can earn 18 credits. Actually, as 11th and 12th graders, they can earn a maximum of 12 credits. Our kids do their work experience after school. You must remember that most of them spend a full six hours in classes at school during the school day. They are accumulating plenty of credits.

Q - Mike, how much of your after-school time is taken for YETP?
A - Officially, only five hours per week. Actually, it takes about 10 hours a week. I am the work site supervisor and the counselor. Even with only 24 job sites, it is quite a job.

Q - It there an entry level GPA needed in order for youth to enter your YETP program?
A - No. Our students have raised their GPAs after enrolling in our YETP program.

Q - Kay, what do you have to do with the YETP money given to career education in the Indiana State Department of Public Instruction?
A - Nothing except communication. Kim Powers manages the money. Her RFPs are directed mainly toward 14-15 year olds. She buys a fair amount of hardware and software, some of which is frequently used by 16-17 year olds in the LEAs.

Trudy McNulty and John Fitzsimmons - South Portland, Maine

Trudy (LEA representative)

We have a TRANSITIONAL SERVICES IN-SCHOOL YETP PROGRAM. For years, South Portland has had a strong career education program. Our assistant superintendent developed this "transition program" to go along with our existing career education effort. It is aimed specifically at helping youth make the transition from school to work, not at job placement. YETP decided to fund this proposal after the concept was accepted by all the Cumberland County superintendents.

This TRANSITION PROGRAM is a one-semester class that meets three to five times per week. It currently is operating in 16 high schools and two prisons. We pay no wages for class attendance, BUT we give academic credit. The course includes:

- A unit on interests, aptitudes, decisionmaking, values.
- Career exploration, including field trips, shadowing, etc. A major tool here is the GIS (Guidance Information System) computer, including terminals for each school. The GIS makes us very visible to the LEA and, since GIS is made available to all the students in each school, very attractive as well.
- Labor market and training opportunities information.
- Teaching job seeking/getting skills.
- Teaching personal money management and job holding skills.

UNDERLYING THE WHOLE PROGRAM IS AN EMPHASIS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF POSITIVE WORK ATTITUDES.

Our contract calls for 600 YETP youth. We are actually serving about 1,000 youth so that we can be sure of having enough YETP-eligible youth participating. We are used by the rest of the school as a kind of "dumping ground." As a result, we get a lot of special education kids and multiple-problem kids. We welcome all these students because they need our help more than most. Our contract calls for 50 percent YETP-eligible kids and 50 percent non-income eligible kids in this "transition" program. As a result, we are really "mainstreaming" YETP youth. Participants in this program range from prospective lawyers to prospective unskilled laborers. This classroom mix exposes students to others they would not normally associate with in regular classes. They learn to appreciate and respect each other, and all benefit.

Our staff are academically certified teachers and teacher assistants. In some cases, though certainly not all, assistants appear to be more "people-oriented" while our teachers are more "content-oriented," perhaps because of their training. These staff persons are all paid for by YETP funds.

We have a designated liaison person in each school (usually a guidance counselor) who runs interference for us between our YETP program staff and the school.

We did not contract for academic credit. This is a local decision made by each LEA. During our first semester of operation, 11 of our 18 LEAs awarded academic credit ranging from 1/4 credit to 1/2 credit. During the following semester, all 18 LEAs awarded some academic credit. It is necessary to use academically certified teachers for this to be possible.

Our MOICC (Maine Occupational Information Coordinating Committee) has used the Governor's discretionary funds to expand this "transition program" to 12 additional LEAs in other parts of Maine.

John (Prime Sponsor representative)

One thing that has happened is that because of this "transition program," CETA has developed a better understanding and appreciation of the LEAs and vice versa.

Our "successes" in this TRANSITION PROGRAM include:

- Of 309 youth enrolled, we had 91 percent complete the program. Forty-seven percent of these youth found employment, at an average cost of $250 per youth.
- The number of LEAs granting academic credit rose from 11 to 18 (out of 18 possible).
- CETA personnel were invited to LEAs, as resource persons, by about three or four LEAs during the first year. This year, CETA personnel have been out as resource persons in LEAs at least 12-16 times and get calls to go much more often. LEA personnel have come to respect what we "CETA types" have learned about out-of-school economically disadvantaged youth.

One of the real "highlights" of all this was our provision of inservice education for all members of the "Transition Program Team," including the counselors. This inservice education was put on by one of our colleges with participants receiving college credit.

Questions and Answers

Q - Can any youth, regardless of income, be involved in this "transition program"?

A - Under our contract, we must serve 50 percent YETP-eligible youth. Last year, we pushed hard to make all, or almost all, participants fit the criterion of being "YETP income-eligible." It has worked out much better since we made the "50-50" split and quit segregating these youth from all others.

Q - Is this "transition program" a supplement to your regular career education program?

A - Yes, in South Portland it is. In some other LEAs which never had any career education, this program is "career education" to them.

Q - Are you not offering work experience?

A - That is right. We offer no work experience, only transition services.

Q - Do your CETA teachers teach kids all day in the LEA like other teachers?

A - Yes. However, most of the classes contain fewer than 12 students. This is necessary because of the individual counseling nature of the material.

Q - Are your CETA teachers being accepted by other teachers?

A - Increasingly, yes.

Q - Do you think "transition services" would be better if you had them at the junior high level instead of at the senior high level?

A - They should be provided at both levels. In the beginning, we targeted second semester 12th graders and discovered it was too late for them; i.e., they were too worried about finding a job to worry much about career awareness/exploration. At the senior high level, career exploration should be started earlier than 12th grade.

THREE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

o How to solve problems growing out of the requirement for 22 percent of YETP funds going to LEAs when many needy youth are not in schools.

- How to help Prime Sponsors see and use career education as a linking vehicle for YETP.
- How to integrate various CETA funds into a year-round CETA Youth Program.

Issue: How to solve problems growing out of the requirements for 22 percent of YETP funds going to LEAs when many needy youth are not in schools

John: Finite dollars are the problem. We have an excellent in-school program and an excellent out-of-school program. Questions often arise as to why the LEA does not use its own funds for the in-school program. This puts LEAs in conflict with CBOs. Last year, we gave 22 percent to the LEA, but this year we gave the LEA 50 percent of our YETP funds. Obviously, ths year finds us serving fewer youth in our out-of-school program. We could, of course, use Title II-B funds for either in-school or out-of-school youth, but that is not much of a solution to this basic problem.

Esther: Who is responsible for serving the out-of-school youth?

John: For youth up to age 18, the LEA is responsible, whether the youth are in school or not. Misunderstandings begin to arise when LEAs see CETA as a "dumping ground" for troubled kids.

Jim: Many CBOs' existence depends on their ability to write CETA programs that get funded. As a result, they are very responsive to us. We get a lot of flak from CBOs that complain that LEAs do not really care about out-of-school youth, although, with our current program, CBOs cannot accurately say that. The CBO tends to look at the problem as a remedial one, whereas the LEA tends to look at it from a preventive/developmental view.

Anne: Where has the interest come within the LEA to serve out-of-school youth?

Jim: Our vocational education departments have put in the extra effort needed here.

Kay: It depends on the LEA. Sometimes the LEA can operate through the superintendent. Other times, the key person may be the principal, the counselor, or even a teacher.

Mike: Our LEA's main goal is to help every student graduate from high school. I have used YETP funds to meet this goal by going to two or three out-of-school youth this year and saying, "IF you will come back to school and take a couple of classes, I will get you a work experience job for which you will also get credit toward graduation. Come back and get your diploma!"

John: It costs $300 per youth for an LEA to put each in-school youth through "transition services"; for out-of-school youth, these "transition services" cost $2,000 per youth. Still, some argue for one and some for the other.

Larry: We are interested, as CETA, in employment outcomes -- i.e., did this youth get a job? Whether or not the youth gets a high school diploma does not count much in the Department of Labor "brownie book." The youth we are concerned about, the economically disadvantaged, want jobs. This does not mean we are opposed to academic credit. On the contrary, even if it is a CBO giving vocational training, we seek academic credit.

Trudy: Just getting a job is not enough. Unless the youth have some idea of where they are heading in terms of career plans, we do them little good just finding them jobs. That is what we try to recognize both in CETA "transition services" and in career education. Too many kids are oriented to finding "beer and gas money." We need to help them think beyond that.

John: AGREE. It is good when kids are exposed to many careers, BUT the reality is that CETA must be concerned about jobs. CETA is a short-term thing that must produce results by the end of each Fiscal Year. The planned long-run benefits of career education are fine, but they do not count much in the CETA "rewards system."

Jim: CETA must learn how to change with the tide from this undue emphasis on short-term goals of jobs -- i.e., of employment -- to a longer-run developmental emphasis on employability.

Esther: AGREE. The law contains a mechanism for YETP and career education to work together toward this goal of employability.

Larry: Our LEA now gets 85 percent of the YETP funds, not the 22 percent minimum. We are using 15 percent of our YETP funds for a special program for out-of-school kids aimed at providing them with training in criminal justice at our local community college.

John: How can you possibly adequately serve out-of-school youth if you are using 85 percent of your YETP funds for in-school youth?

Larry: We felt that 50 percent would be okay and that 85 percent would be too high. But the funding level turned out to be 85 percent. We have 800 out-of-school youth in need of help. We cannot help them all with the 15 percent of funds that are left.

Do Prime Sponsors think it might be better to use more CETA II-B funds to serve in-school youth and so reserve more YETP funds for out-of-school youth?

Ana Maria: NO. The ideal LEA/CBO split for the YETP funds is 50/50. The largest proportion of youth in our area is in school.

Kay: Flexibility is built into YETP in order to meet priorities in each geographic area. In our community, our YETP funds come from CETA "Balance of State."

We subcontract with an LEA, an "OCCUPATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER," *or* a joint ODC/LEA Service. The priorities in Hammond, Indiana, are not the same as the ones in Evansville, Indiana.

Fran: I would not like to see the Federal Government do anything more than mandate a *minimum* set-aside of YETP funds for LEAs. Local communities need all the flexibility they can get. Many out-of-school youth *have* learned "survival skills." In *this* sense, it could be said the need is greater for in-school youth. Youth under age 18 cannot get work permits unless they are in school, thus making it necessary for LEAs to work with CBOs serving out-of-school youth so that an educational program can be worked out for such youth. In our community, when a kid drops out of high school and we cannot find where she/he is, we contact our CBOs and they are often able to help us. We are trying to get over the community complaint that CETA is, in effect, "bribing" kids to drop out of high school. While this *has* happened in the past, we, the LEA, are now working with CBOs to prevent it from happening in the future.

Issue: How to help Prime Sponsors see and use career education as a linking vehicle for YETP

Esther: As a career education person for the last five years, it seems to me I have been doing what YETP says should now be done. It is hard to say this to CETA officials without their thinking that we in career education are asking them for money. We are not. We have been supplying youth with employability/life survival skills for years, and this is what YETP is now trying to do. I see career education serving as a thread that will make YETP goals become a continuing, sustaining, coordinating force that can help give some permanence in education to the YETP mission. I know, of course, that many YETP decisions are political ones and, thus, things may not work out this way. But this is what should happen.

Kay: AGREE. Career education is a resource for CETA, especially with Title II-B, through which we have been asked for the past five years to work on "employability skills." In a sense, CETA during this period has been re-inventing the career education "wheel." CETA personnel do not know enough about career education. They need to know what career education has to offer them.

Mike: Schools and guidance people are, in many respects, "guilty as charged." There are lots of LEAs which have not really tried to implement career education. Schools are too academically-oriented.

Kay: AGREE. Ivy Tech (a postsecondary vocational-technical system in Indiana) has been very good for the CETA population, but regular LEAs are not changing enough yet.

John: Pressures and "mandates" for education systems change very, very fast. The problem is how to make this linkage with career education. Maybe we will have to use CETA money to make it happen.

Fran: In a recent survey which we did at the 8th and 10th grade levels, over 80 percent of the kids indicated: (a) they planned to go to work immediately after high school; or (b) they did not know what they would be doing; or (c) they planned to combine work with further schooling. Kids do need to know what their options are.

John: If we put CETA money into local training sessions to be held jointly for both LEA and Prime Sponsor personnel, oriented around the general topic of employability skills, we might be able to make this CETA/career education linkage through the increased communication that comes about when people learn together.

Ana Maria: AGREE. This kind of joint training is needed. We conducted a 1 1/2 day session for our youth counselors on "career awareness," BUT our school counselors were not included as they should have been (due to lateness of the school year).

Kay: AGREE. We have talked about this general idea in our office and have plans to do this kind of joint training of LEA and CETA personnel on a regional basis. We have a ready-made topic in Indiana, because our career education money from YETP went to our SEA and part of that money has been used to train the "trainers." Some CETA "types" have been invited to these conferences, but not many and not often.

Ana Maria: Both CETA and LEA "types" would gain from joint training, and it would help the communication problem too. To be effective, joint training would almost have to be carried out at the local community level, not the State or regional level.

Trudy: AGREE. It is more than just acquiring a common language. At least as important is building good personal and working relationships between LEA and CETA persons.

Fran: It seems to me that California's "master trainer" concept could be used here to implement John's idea. This "master trainer" plan grew out of early career education activities in California. The basic idea is to take experts from a number of communities in a number of areas who then go in to a new LEA and meet with their counterparts to share ideas, methods, materials, and ideas (e.g., an elementary teacher with elementary teachers; a counselor with a group of other counselors).

Esther: Another possibility to implement John's idea would be the "transfer of success" idea growing out of ESEA Title IV-C. This concept begins with the notion of a "validated" program -- i.e., one with concrete data proving its success which can be replicated in other sites. We could think about getting validated LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements that could be replicated in other communities.

Fran: I went to a meeting last week in Salt Lake City that was run jointly by the National Employment Training Association (NETA) and AVA. The meeting was aimed at getting vocational educators together with Prime Sponsor personnel.

NOTE: This is good, but not the same as getting academic teachers, counselors, and career education persons together with Prime Sponsor "types."

Esther: IF joint training in "employability skills" is to be done, we certainly should have employers involved as participants.

Larry: AGREE. We need an inventory of employer resources so that we can build higher-quality career-oriented work sites.

Fran: An example of this can be seen in the work our ROP program did with our local telephone company. The telephone company provided the equipment and the training standards. As a result, we were successful in placing 99 percent of the youth.

Harlan: We are doing it somewhat along the lines of STIP, to get more business involvement.

Fran: If employers are included in these training sessions, they can help us greatly as we attempt to define "employability skills."

Esther: I agree that employers should be included. The important point to keep in mind is that these training sessions should focus on employability skills, not on specific entry-level vocational skills (that we already know about).

Trudy: In Maine, the telephone company was getting so many requests from LEAs that it did inservice for phone company persons so they would know better how to serve those LEAs requesting their help.

Fran: CBOs should also be included in this joint training. They, too, are trying to meet some of these same youth needs for general employability/adaptability skills.

Esther: If LEAs and CETA "types" develop a local plan, they could at least take it to CBOs in their community and ask them if they want to participate in it.

John: This kind of joint training could easily, and legally, be done using the 5 percent Governor's discretionary funds provided to build linkages among LEAs and CBOs with CETA Prime Sponsors. The Governor's funds, in our State, have been used to fund Research and Development Projects and innovative programs. Most of the Governor's projects serve a limited number of participants in restricted geographical areas. Providing professional trainers to assist schools, CBOs, and Prime Sponsors to effectively deliver employability training to participants would make excellent use of such funds. Every State could use its 5 percent Governor's discretionary funds to set up a "master trainer" plan to get this done.

Ana Maria: We should also include State Employment Security Agencies in this kind of joint training. They often are asked to provide supportive services (including general employability skills) to out-of-school youth. They have special expertise in PSE which could be a helpful part of the total learning that should take place.

John: Both the Governor's Office and the CETA Prime Sponsors should like the following idea: (NOTE: THERE WAS GENERAL CONSENSUS ON THIS GENERAL IDEA AND ITS ELEMENTS.)

We could build an inventory of CETA/LEA/CBO/private sector/Employment Service persons who have special expertise in one or more aspects of making and putting into practice a good LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement (e.g., the "lead time" problem, the "work site" problem, the "academic credit" problem). An initial beginning on this effort could be made by identifying persons with these kinds of interests and expertise from those participating in this set of miniconferences, representing 75 communities across the nation. In each State, an inventory of this kind could be built based on those local communities where, in the joint judgment of CETA Prime Sponsors and SEA officials, the very best LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements are in operation.

We could provide local communities with a list of such resource persons in their State and a plan whereby communities could invite as many of them as they need, to meet jointly to discuss "employability skills" or even the more generic topic of "LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements." Money from the Governor's discretionary 5 percent funds could pay for resource persons' expenses in going to other communities on a "master trainer" basis to help their counterparts solve some of the problems involved. These funds could also arrange for some of the key persons to have "super training" on the general topic of "EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS" so that they will be qualified to run a one to two day joint workshop for at least LEA and Prime Sponsor personnel. We should consider asking private sector employers, CBOs, and State Employment Service persons to also participate in this joint training on EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS.

In each of the settings represented in the joint training session and as part of this joint training session, specific components could be identified that are not taking place or planned to take place for delivery of Employability Skills to youth. An integrated, coordinated community plan could be developed for delivering EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS to all youth, using all resources represented in this joint training workshop. Using the Governor's 5 percent discretionary funds, a system could be established for evaluating the effectiveness of LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements now in operation. This system would be applied to local communities willing to have these data collected. Each LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement passing this evaluation process would be put on a special list and made available for other communities to replicate if they so desired. The 5 percent Governor's discretionary money could provide funds for "validated" LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement communities to send personnel to other local communities which decide to "adopt" their model.

The goal is to establish, within each State, using the 5 percent Governor's discretionary funds, a system that would:

(a) Provide a pool of "trainers" capable of going into any community and conducting joint workshops on GENERAL EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS for a combination of LEA/Prime Sponsor/private sector/CBO/State Employment Service personnel that would:

    (1) Provide participants with common knowledge regarding these skills and ways they can and should be imparted to youth;

    (2) Provide participants with a common language so they can understand each other better as they attempt to work together;

(3) Build personal relationships and trust/confidence among workshop participants so that each becomes; and more understanding and accepting of each other.

(4) Provide a beginning basis for participants to use in building an integrated, coordinated community plan for delivering GENERAL EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS to youth, with special emphasis on needs of economically disadvantaged youth.

(b) Provide a pool of "experts" (in a wide variety of facets of making and implementing LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements) who could be combined in a "custom-made team" to go to another community and provide that community with concrete suggestions and examples of how they could solve particular problems involved in their LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

(c) Provide a series of "validated" LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements that can be widely publicized throughout the State (or even the nation) and be adopted by other communities.

Issue: How to integrate various CETA funds into a year-round CETA Youth Program

Harlan: We have a choice in YETP between: (a) making YETP a nine-month effort and using SYEP for the summer activity; or (b) serving fewer youth in YETP but serving them on a 12-month basis, using SYEP as a separate summer activity for others.

Fran: We in the LEAs would like to integrate YETP with SYEP, in part because the paper work required to shift from one to the other is horrendous. In addition, doing that paper work breaks into our efforts to provide continuity of services. Every youth eligible for SYEP is eligible for YETP so, at least if one were to work backwards from SYEP to YETP, one would have the next year's possible pool of YETP youth identified (if you wished to apply the SYEP standards to YETP admittance).

Jim: The short lead time is causing many LEAs to back off from any kind of integrated plan with local Prime Sponsors. I do not understand why we cannot be given more lead time.

Esther: Why not routinely think of YETP as a year-round program with a summer component?

Larry: It is. We ask LEAs to submit a summer plan for YETP that is separate from their academic year YETP plan.

John: SYEP can take 14-15 year olds and pay them wages. YETP cannot pay wages to 14-15 year olds.

John: Esther is right. We get more CETA funds to run SYEP for nine weeks than we do to run YETP for nine months. It would be far better to lump this money into one integrated program. TO DO THIS WOULD REQUIRE A CHANGE IN LEGISLATION, WHICH SHOULD BE MADE.

NOTE: Everyone agreed with John on this statement.

Esther: IF we could think of using YETP funds to provide "transition services" as an integral part of a year-round YETP program for all students, we would, in effect, be providing "career education" to all students over the whole 12 months.

Trudy: If we did this, would the result be called "YETP" instead of "career education"?

NOTE: It would not hurt anything if that was the result.

John: We could think of "transition services for all" during the year provided that economically disadvantaged youth receive, in addition: (a) paid work experience during the school year; and (b) both transition services and paid work experience during the summer. The advantage would be an opportunity to use the same YETP staff on a year-round basis instead of having to hire a new "green" bunch each summer.

Kay: In addition, John's plan would satisfy LEAs because it would allow for some spots for certified teachers to be available on a 12-month basis. By using certified teachers, we get a third advantage: we would be over much of the "hassle" about awarding academic credit.

Larry: AGREE: Our current situation is wrong from two standpoints: (a) Prime Sponsors are trying to force LEAs to run "something special" in the summer; and (b) CBOs now spend 80 percent of their time trying to recruit youth for the summer program. IF John's plan were to be adopted, the advantages that would result include: (a) LEAs would be much more willing to participate, including accepting responsibility for identifying and encouraging eligible youth to participate; and (b) CBOs could spend their time identifying and improving the quality of work sites so as to make them more meaningful learning experiences for youth. In these ways, both the talents of the LEAs and the talents of the CBOs would be used in appropriate, rather than inappropriate, ways.

Ana Maria: In our community, CBOs could not identify the work sites. This is a Prime Sponsor responsibility.

Fran: The recruitment for our summer program was a week-long effort held at the fairgrounds with CBOs, LEAs, and prospective employers. When we gathered the information about jobs that employers would be making available for the summer program, we took all of our SYEP youth applications and tried to match them with prospective jobs by geographic areas and by whether the employer wanted an in-school or an out-of-school youth. Each agency, whether a particular LEA or a particular CBO, then serves as the one contact for each employer; i.e., employer "slots" are divided up so that a given slot goes to only one agency. In this way, we avoid a lot of confusion.

John: The SYEP program tends to limit its scope by using work experience as its main thrust. Work experience participant wages are totally subsidized by CETA; thus the participants are restricted to non-profit agencies for work sites. Why not extend the program to the private sector by making it OJT, rather than work experience? This would open up to youth a great many new varieties of career exploration opportunities.

Esther: The new PIC Councils should be able to make this happen.

Ana Maria: Cooperative education persons could be hired during the summer to supplement regular OJT and could, in effect, make OJT into a cooperative education program for SYEP youth. (In CETA language it would be called "OJT," but in LEA language it would be called "cooperative education.")

Kay: NO. The LEA and CETA have clear and separate definitions for "OJT" and for "cooperative education." They are not interchangeable terms.

Fran: One way of viewing the difference is to observe that you can be doing "OJT" without doing "cooperative education," BUT you cannot be doing "cooperative education" unless you have an "OJT" element.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 131
Transition Services for Non-Disadvantaged Youth
May 10 and 11, 1979

Participants

Ms. Karen McDowell
Youth Employment and Training
Carson City School District
Carson City, Neveda

Mr. James Calder
CETA Director
Balance of State Nevada
Nevada Employment Security Department
Carson City, Nevada

Ms. Jorja Jacobs
Career Education Coordinator
Education Service Center
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Ms. Joyce Stewart
Program Planner - CETA
Manpower Planning Division
Tulsa, Oklahoma

Mr. William D. Jackson
Supervisor
Federal Employment and Training
Waterford School District
Waterford, Michigan

Mr. Greg Kazmierski
Youth Program Supervisor
Oakland County ETA
Pontiac, Michigan

Mr. Robert L. Griffith
Supervisor, YETP
State Department of Education
Charleston, West Virginia

Ms. Lisa Coon
Program Coordinator, YETP
Employment and Training Division
Balance of State CETA
Charleston, West Virginia

Observers

Mr. Gerald G. Gold
Program Officer
National Manpower Institute
Washington, D. C.

Ms. Anita Barber
Chief Specialist, Career Education
State Department of Education
Montgomery, Alabama

Dr. Ann Harrison
Planning, Research, and Evaluation
Kansas State Department of Education
Topeka, Kansas

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief State School Officers
Washington, D. C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to convince communities that there is a need for LEA/ Prime Sponsor agreements.

2. How to overcome the bad press that surrounds Federal programs in general.

3. How to get educators to accept the need to change and the need for outside sources of funding.

4. How to overcome paperwork problems involved in getting an LEA/ Prime Sponsor agreement funded at the local level.

5. How to help inexperienced communities learn how to write proposals that will be funded.

6. How to establish criteria for use in deciding to award academic credit.

7. How to make an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement work in ways that enhance the school district's career education efforts.

8. How to use CETA funding to provide LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements to a number of smaller school districts within a Prime Sponsor's area.

9. How to solve authority/responsibility problems in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

10. How to help Prime Sponsors use the resources of LEAs to better deliver YETP programs.

11. How to solve political problems involved in making LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements work.

12. How to establish and maintain good working relationships among Prime Sponsors, Community Based Organizations, and LEAs in full delivery of a community YETP effort.

13. How to use YETP to get a greater LEA commitment to career/ vocational education.

14. How to resolve LEA desires to serve 14-15 year olds in a preventive way with the Federal emphasis on remedial efforts for older youth.

15. How to solve the problem of serving school dropouts in an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement when LEAs tend to give priority to in-school youth.

16. How to serve youth in ways that benefit them while simultaneously meeting needs of employers.

17. How to resolve competition problems that arise between LEAs and CBOs.

18. How to make LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements work in light of territorial turf problems existing among LEAs in a particular geographic area.

19. How to identify and get a commitment from some persons in each school who will follow through on an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement at the building and school district levels.

20. How to use career education, not just vocational education, as a vehicle for use in implementing an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

21. How to develop and maintain a positive professional attitude on all sides in carrying out an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement.

22. How to make "shadowing" a valuable device in the summer SYEP program.

23. How to serve college dropouts in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

24. How to extend the YETP emphasis on junior high kids and relate it to K-6 career education.

25. How to get the broader community involved in a total YETP effort.

26. How to get clarification of meaning of YETP rules and regulations.

27. How to solve problems of making unique LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements in a given Prime Sponsor area.

28. How to get personal commitments from LEAs to use hardware supplied by Prime Sponsors.

29. How to solve Prime Sponsor problems of making sure all LEA youth are aware of opportunities to participate in YETP and in other CETA programs.

30. How to get explanations from the Federal Government with reference to the rationale and reasons for various changes in Federal policy.

31. What are good contract negotiation strategies for developing LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements?

32. How to solve the "acronym problem" in the Department of Labor and in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

33. How to solve YETP eligibility certification problems that include certifying non-disadvantaged youth.

34. How to encourage LEAs to write proposals for non-disadvantaged youth when they are not a targeted group.

35. How to overcome duplication of services among various Federal and State agencies.

36. How to solve cooperative education/CETA job developer problems.

37. How to get over defensiveness that some career education "types" are expressing about YETP.

38. Does the Department of Health, Education and Welfare definition of "handicapped" apply to LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements?

39. How do you develop a proposal that will provide continuing benefits to the LEA after the contract is over?

DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY YETP EFFORTS

Joyce Stuart and Jorja Jacobs - Tulsa, Oklahoma

Joyce (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our career employment experiences component (a) for 10th and 11th graders, is 10-15 hours per week of work experience plus a vocational exploration program in the summer; (b) for 12th graders, is also 10-15 hours per week of work experience, but these students go into an OJT program in the summer.

We have transition services for both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged youth. Our transition services consist of both the SIGI and the GIS computer-assisted guidance systems which we have now in 10 sites. The SIGI system was purchased using Tulsa YETP funds, while the GIS system, installed state-wide, was purchased using the Governor's discretionary funds.

Our non-financial agreements call for these 10 LEAs to provide the counselors required to use SIGI and GIS with all students. We have not yet been required to identify the number of non-disadvantaged youth being served.

Last year the staff of the Prime Sponsor's primary subcontractor did all operational work on things such as job development, work site supervision, etc. This year, the Tulsa County schools have contracted for this kind of work. The schools perform it with their staff persons working out of our primary subcontractor's office.

Our county superintendent set up one alternative school partially supported this year by CETA using YCCIP funds. The school is for kids who had trouble making it through the regular high schools.

Jorja (LEA representative)

We received four of the SIGI (System of Interactive Guidance Information) and GIS (Guidance Information System) computer terminals for use in the Tulsa Public Schools and placed them in the four high schools having the highest proportion of economically disadvantaged youth. While the terminals are in these schools, the computer itself is housed at the Tulsa Junior College (which had developed it before YETP came into existence).

SIGI is a values-oriented career decision-making system operating as computer-assisted guidance. It was installed in the summer of 1978. This year GIS is being put in. It functions using the same terminals we use for SIGI. It differs from SIGI in that it is more oriented around jobs and occupations rather than around values.

Counselors in each high school were trained on what the SIGI and the GIS systems were and how to use them with students. Students can get computer printouts with both systems. The advantage to the LEAs, of course, is that, once the terminals are installed, their only expense is updating information in the system. Our only problem has been working with schools to help students learn how SIGI and GIS could be used.

People at Tulsa Junior College came up with the idea of using YETP funds for SIGI and Governor's discretionary funds for GIS. We then were able to sell it to the Department of Labor Regional Office.

Questions and Answers

Q - Did you have any problems getting approval to purchase this equipment through CETA?

A- No. The regional office was very supportive of this project.

Q - What was the cost of the equipment?

A - Original cost was $40,000-$50,000. It takes about $10,000 per year to maintain it.

Q - What proportion of the kids using this equipment are disadvantaged.

A - We do not know. All of our YETP kids are required to use it, and many other kids use it as well. Each kid has an ID number for use in accessing the computer, so we can find out how much computer time is used by economically disadvantaged as opposed to non-disadvantaged students.

Q - Doesn't this computer system serve the "advantaged" kid better than it serves the "disadvantaged"?

A - To some extent, it has been more useful to the advantaged youth. These youth are more likely to inquire about guidance tools available. Also, the advantaged youth often have a higher reading level, and the program requires reading to answer the questions placed on the terminal's screen. The YETP youth are required to use the computer program, though, whereas there is no such requirement of the non-disadvantaged youth.

Q - Does the Prime Sponsor have a contract with each school?
A - No. We have one with each school district.

Q - Do you have YETP coordinators at each site?
A - We have one counselor at each school who serves as our contact person. These counselors are paid by the school system, not out of YETP funds.

Q - What is your intake process for YETP?
A - Our State Employment Service certifies youth as eligible. After counseling with the youth, the Employment Service also determines which CETA program best fits each one. The intake forms never go to the school.

Q - Why do you need both SIGI and GIS?
A - They complement each other by providing values plus occupational information. It is very important that the youth knows his/her values (SIGI) before deciding on an occupation. Then the youth needs the occupational information provided by GIS. This year, we are adding two IBM DISCOVER computer-assisted guidance systems in two other high schools.

Q - How did you talk your Department of Labor Regional Office into buying SIGI?
A - It was a good deal for them. Tulsa Junior College agreed to provide technical assistance free and initial inservice training of counselors free. In addition, the Governor's discretionary funds (from the Governor's Statewide Youth Services money) were being used to buy GIS, so there were lots of other benefits around.

Q - Are your school counselors accepting responsibility for using SIGI and GIS?
A - On the whole, yes.

Greg Kazmierski and Bill Jackson - Pontiac, Michigan

Greg (Prime Sponsor representative)

We serve youth in the Southeastern quarter of the county. Our most serious problems are in Pontiac itself. Three years ago, our Prime Sponsor provided direct services to high school students under Title I including OJT, classroom training, intake, job referral, employer contacts, etc. The LEA as it exists today was not involved at all.

We realized we could not possibly reach the number of clients we should be serving if we continued to ignore the LEAs. So we went to the 10 LEAs which enrolled most of the economically disadvantaged kids. Working with them, we developed an agency funded primarily by CETA to serve kids in the geographic area covered by these 10 LEAs. We called it the "COUNSELING AND INTAKE AGENCY" (CIA). We now have one agency sponsored by each of the 10 LEAs, with staff hired by the LEA and paid for by CETA funds.

We have a contract with each LEA spelling out (a) what the Prime Sponsor will do; and (b) what the intake agency will do. Each intake agency gets an opportunity for a YETP contract each year.

There are about 100 staff persons employed in the Prime Sponsor's office and from six to ten persons employed in each intake agency. It is important to understand that the Counseling and Intake Agency (CIA) provides services to adults as well as to youth -- i.e., it functions as an arm of CETA that extends way beyond only YETP.

The CIAs are now the sole providers for our entire YETP program, including initial (but not final) eligibility certification. They send the Prime Sponsor a bill once a month. The CIAs even pay the client wages under YETP.

We have gone from a period where there was lots of disagreement between LEA and Prime Sponsor representatives at our monthly meeting to a point where there is now excellent cooperation. It has been an evolutionary process.

Bill (LEA representative)

Our CIAs began in 1976, but CETA started in 1974 with both PSE and NYC. PSE created 115 jobs in our LEA, including placement offices in each high school charged with career planning and job development functions. When the CIA came along, the placement office changed its emphasis to deal with both youth and adults.

Our CIA serves adults as well as youth. It operates under a CETA "Comprehensive Performance Contract."

Our LEA has 22 CETA employees involved in the CIA and placement services within the district.

YETP consists of: (a) 31 career employment experience slots and (b) five work experience positions. We have one position funded to coordinate our LEA YETP program.

YETP, in cooperation with other CETA programs, rents a computer from our intermediate school district which we use both (a) for career planning assistance to youth and adults and (b) as a job file.

Questions and Answers

Q - How do you do monitoring and assessment?
A - We have added our own Prime Sponsor monitors for YETP, including monitoring of work sites. It is a little tough, but it is a very necessary thing to do.

Q - Do you treat your existing CIAs as "sole source contracts," or are you operating under competitive bidding?
A - Both. In effect, we fund those which have been successful in the past. We have not had much success in working with CBOs. We evaluate by comparing output in each CIA with all other CIAs in this system.

Q - What percent of your YETP funds go into your LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements?
A - Eighty percent.

Q - How do you determine who gets a contract for next year?
A - It is based on how well each one did last year.

Q - What are you doing for non-disadvantaged youth under YETP?
A - Every CIA provides career planning and placement for all who request it.

Q - How can you serve adults when your CIAs are located in existing high schools?
A - It is tough. One of the CIAs is in an elementary school that has been closed; it is easier to get adults to come to a setting like that. They are hesitant to walk through a hall full of high school students in order to get to the CIA.

Q - How does your CIA staff relate to the schools' career education efforts?
A - We work closely with EBCE. The K-6 portion of career education is not very strong right now. We are now

getting funds from our SEA to build this up. The CIA provides a great deal of the career education services in the district.

Q - How much money do you get for YETP each year?
A - $1.6 million.

Lisa Coon and Bob Griffith - Charleston, West Virginia

Lisa (Prime Sponsor representative)

As a Balance of State Prime Sponsor, I coordinate the whole statewide program. We have 43 YETP programs in operation. Thirty-eight are through regular YETP funds, while five are through the Governor's five percent funds.

Most of my contracts are with CBOs. We also have a contract with our SEA's Bureau of Vocational Education under which it coordinates the LEA YETP programs.

In my office, most of my responsibilities are to give technical assistance in proposal writing, contract negotiations, monthly reporting, correspondence, money distribution, payroll and monitoring of all programs.

I have 14 in-school projects, two of which are with CBOs. Of 1,823 positions in YETP, 1,215 are for in-school youth. Most of our in-school projects serve non-disadvantaged youth to some extent. A couple are doing a very great deal of this.

Our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement is with each local board of education. However, there is an individual contract developed with the local LEA for its specific YETP program. The staff that the LEA uses consists primarily of people within its own school system who earn additional money for working in YETP. Some projects have program activities after regular school hours.

Bob (LEA representative)

I work in the Bureau of Vocational Education in our SEA. As an SEA Bureau of Vocational-Technical and Adult Education, we deal mostly with vocational schools, but not exclusively. (For example, our very best YETP program is one for out-of-school youth which operates from a school for special education and ABE.) We provide technical assistance workshops to all LEAs interested in making an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. If they ask, we help. And we encourage all LEAs to apply.

Our Prime Sponsor determines which LEAs will be funded. After that, we in the SEA work up the contract details. We have 23 YETP programs in 18 counties (12 are in-school).

There is a good relationship throughout West Virginia among Prime Sponsors, CBOs, and LEAs.

We have a local YETP coordinator in each of our in-school programs. The 12 in-school programs serve over 1,100 youth. For the in-school YETP programs, we have over $900,000, about half of which goes for youth wages and allowances.

Several local school boards in our State are providing academic credit for YETP.

Twenty-eight percent of YETP funds go for in-school programs. More than half of the YETP money goes through our SEA (which, as I said, also operates out-of-school YETP programs).

As far as transition services for non-disadvantaged youth are concerned, our local Board of Education had 1,100-plus students who, under YETP funding, received the Ohio Vocational Interest Survey (OVIS), career study and profile, and self assessment.

My real problem has been finding time to visit all of our LEAs which are participating in YETP.

We have both a financial and a non-financial agreement with the Prime Sponsor for YETP. The SEA flows the money from the Prime Sponsor to each LEA. The Prime Sponsor pays wages and allowances to YETP youth.

Each county writes its own unique program. One program is for only five enrollees, while another has more than 400 enrollees. Still another program provides services to approximately 280 non-disadvantaged youth in outreach, career exploration, and counseling/guidance.

Questions and Answers

Q - Why do you use your State Employment Service to certify eligibility?

A - The employment service has always done the certification of eligibility for us. They do it well.

Q - Are some regular high schools resentful of the fact that you do YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements primarily in vocational schools?

A - We have not had any feedback indicating this to be the case. The opportunity to submit YETP proposals is wide open to any and all LEAs in our State. We have several YETP programs operating now in non-vocational schools.

Q - How do you work with CBOs?
A - Appalachian Educational Lab (AEL) is working now with out-of-school youth but will start also working with LEAs next fall.

Q - Is Bob's office in the SEA CETA-funded?
A - Yes. Most of the administrative money for YETP is going to our SEA, not to the LEAs. LEAs get very little of this administrative money. Money is provided to LEAs to pay costs of counselors and teachers participating in YETP, but this is not "administrative cost." Most of our LEA YETP in-school programs operate after school and/or on a weekend basis and during the summer.

Q - How do you relate with your State Coordinator of Career Education?
A - We use our whole SEA staff in our YETP efforts. When SEA staff persons go to an LEA for purposes of evaluation, they look at YETP operations as well as the total program.

Karen McDowell and Jim Calder - Carson City, Nevada

Karen (LEA representative)

I was a counselor at Carson High before becoming involved with CETA.

Our program is experiential learning combined with work experience; we call it Experience Based Career Education (EBCE). Students have a two-hour block of experiential education plus four hours of regular class during the school day. During this two-hour block, kids can be in the community, working on individual career development projects, individual projects, etc.

Nevada was funded as a model State for EBCE. We have made adaptations in EBCE so that it now fits YETP. At the end of 1977, we needed to do something to keep EBCE going in our LEA. I went to the State CETA office and received funding to write a proposal to help ACADEMICALLY DISADVANTAGED youth. (NOTE: We do not have many "economically disadvantaged" youth in Carson City.) Within two months, I wrote the proposal, contacted students, and developed materials to begin the program.

In addition, CETA has funded two positions for the EBCE program, mine and one other. We now have 47 enrollees. The students have two hours of work experience each day after school. They are 11th and 12th graders, but mostly 11th graders. Our hope is that, after this year in YETP, they will move into the 12th grade regular work study/work experience program in PSE. We try hard to place them in a work experience area consistent with their tentative career choices.

We operate under both YETP and YCCIP. Of our 47 enrollees, 10 are in private industry and 25 are employed through our program. Three or four parents have refused to let their kids participate in our YETP work experience program because they object to filling out the required income data forms.

Jim (Prime Sponsor representative)

Our first YETP contract was in 1978. Prior to that, it all went through our State Employment Service. It really was not working too well there.

We are a Balance of State CETA. When we started putting YETP into LEAs, there was resistance. We now have eight of our 16 LEAs in YETP and will have 10 of them in our SYEP program this summer. It took almost a year to get LEAs to recognize that they could get YETP money by applying directly to us.

Step 1 - I went to the school superintendents' meeting to talk to them about YETP. Most resisted, but two of them offered to become involved.

Step 2 - We took a strong superintendent and put him on our Governor's CETA Advisory Council. That has helped some.

Step 3 - For orientation, we sent several superintendents to some out-of-state CETA meetings.

Step 4 - We initiated and now publish regularly a newsletter aimed at giving publicity to our successful YETP programs. Some LEAs have started working with us, in part, because they wanted this kind of favorable publicity.

Step 5 - We initiated a procedure whereby we send our RFPs to all LEAs in our State. We have found that, if we just keep doing this, some will apply sooner or later.

Step 6 - We try to identify one key person in each participating LEA who will accept responsibility for making YETP go in his/her LEA.

ADVICE: It is a mistake for a Prime Sponsor to write a contract for an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement and forward it to the LEA for signature. When you do that, the LEA may sign but would not understand what is in the contract. We find it much better to involve the LEA in writing the contract. Even though this takes a lot of time, once the contract is signed, the LEA knows what it is responsible for doing.

For SYEP we have designed a "LAYMAN'S LANGUAGE CONTRACT," which is very simple and easy to understand. We may use that format for YETP contracts next year.

Step 7 - Once an LEA Prime Sponsor agreement is signed, it is essential to provide training for LEA personnel. We did a three-day workshop for all those LEAs involved this year. This inservice education is an absolute must.

Technical assistance and monitoring - Technical assistance is not a problem but monitoring is. We have now developed inservice procedures on "how to monitor" and on "how not to monitor" that are proving very effective.

CETA/ES/LEA Coordination - If we have a few high school students enrolled in YETP who are definitely going to drop out of high school, we take them over to our Employment Service and try to get them in a CETA Title I program. If a YETP high school senior finishes in June, we also take him/her to the Employment Service for counseling and placement assistance. Many of them are not yet job-ready when they finish high school.

Services to non-disadvantaged - We fund, say, a career education coordinator in a given LEA. Typically that person does not have enough YETP enrollees to keep busy all day. We thus let him/her use any remaining time to work with non-YETP kids even though his/her entire salary is paid for by YETP funds.

Questions and Answers

Q - How long has your independent monitoring unit been in effect?
A - About nine months. We are pleased with it.

Q - How often is each site monitored?
A - Once every three to four weeks.

Q - What State legislative problems do you have now with reference to CETA?
A - Some State legislators think that, by cutting Federal positions, they are saving the taxpayers' money, even though they are not, of course.

Q - If YETP funds had not come along, would your LEA have picked up your earlier EBCE program and paid for it with local funds?

A - No. Maybe they would have in some future year but not at that time.

Q - Do you use the 10 percent YETP funds for non-economically disadvantaged youth? How do you keep your records on all of this?

A - We pay YETP participants for work experience, but we do not pay other youth in our EBCE program for their work experience. The non-YETP eligible kids in our EBCE program get their work experience through unsubsidized jobs that they find (with or without our help) in the private sector.

Q - In your EBCE program, is the career exploration portion of experiential learning regarded the same as work experience?

A - No. Work experience takes place entirely after school.

FOUR ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to establish criteria for use in deciding to award academic credit.
- How to get the broader community involved in a total YETP effort.
- What are good contract negotiation strategies for developing LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements?
- How to overcome duplication of services among various Federal and State agencies.

Issue: How to establish criteria for use in deciding to award academic credit

Lisa: Many LEAs are reluctant to award credit for YETP because they do not know how to measure performance in YETP. Should we use "attendance" as a criterion? Are there performance goals that should be used?

Bob: There is little problem having LEAs offer elective credit; the problem is getting credit awarded for academic subjects (like English or math) on the basis of work experience in YETP.

Lisa: Our problem is getting criteria for use in determining how to give credit in YETP when we do not have any "grades" to assign to YETP participants.

Jorja: Our LEA simply says that the State Department of Education would not "allow" it.

Bob: That is the opposite for us. Our SEA wants credit given for YETP. Our problem is in getting criteria to LEAs that they will accept. We now have a CBO operating, in effect, an alternative school in three counties where they will grant credit. Our SEA will accept this credit if recommended by the local board of education under whose auspices this alternative school must come.

Karen: In Nevada, YETP kids do get credit based on: (a) number of hours per week spent in YETP; (b) grades given youth by the employer (just as we do in our regular cooperative education program). The primary drawback we have is that only seniors can get this credit; and it is "elective" credit counting toward high school graduation. Under our system, it takes 465 hours to earn one credit.

Joyce: We found that the person doing the "grading" has to be an employee of the school system; the work site supervisor was not allowed to do the "grading." We have a summer program in which youth go to a vocational-technical school in the morning for career exploration (academic credit is given).

Some LEAs are resisting giving credit for work experience in YETP -- perhaps, in part, because they see that if they do so, they may lose some kid from cooperative education.

Jorja: We have no problems in awarding credit for work experience as work experience, but problems arise when we try to get academic credit for it. Employers are more willing to take on cooperative education kids than YETP kids.

Karen: Maybe that is because employers perceive YETP kids as "not as good."

Jim: Who sets up the work sites for your YETP kids?

Jorja: The Prime Sponsor sets up work sites for all YETP kids, whereas the LEA sets up work sites for kids enrolled in the regular cooperative education program.

Jim: In our community, the LEA sets up work sites both for cooperative education and for YETP. As a result, nobody knows whether a particular kid is a YETP enrollee or a regular cooperative education student. In many cases, kids from both programs do their own job development by locating work sites for themselves.

Jorja: How did you get the LEAs to accept responsibility for developing work sites for YETP youth?

Jim: In our LEA, we fund two positions with YETP funds; some of the work of these persons is directed toward work site development.

Joyce: Our LEAs could have funded some of these positions with their "22 percent YETP money," but they did not want to take the money. As a result, we wound up with a non-financial agreement.

Bill: We allow academic credit for YETP/SPEDY (SYEP), and we are planning to offer it in two ways: (a) as an integrated part of our career education/vocational education program; and (b) as an arrangement, on a case by case basis, for students who need work experience in the summer for graduation. We try not to make any differences between SYEP/YETP kids and other kids during the school year.

In our summer program, there is a work experience component (200 hours) and a classroom component (100 hours). The YETP youth can earn one credit based on: (a) attendance; (b) the supervisor's evaluation of work experience (whether the supervisor is an LEA employee or not); and (c) a recommendation of a certificated teacher. In this summer program, we teach: (a) remedial reading, (b) employability skills, (c) career planning, and (d) survival skills.

Karen: We make no differentiation between YETP youth and regular cooperative vocational education students. When we record credit on their permanent record, it is recorded as "work experience credit" for both. Our criteria for awarding credit include: (a) attendance, (b) performance, and (c) the number of hours involved. These are the same criteria used for awarding credit for cooperative vocational education work experience.

Lisa: Only a few of our LEAs are awarding credit for YETP work experience.

Jim: We put it in our contract with LEAs that they must offer academic credit. If they do not agree to do so, we do not give them a contract.

Jorja: That Prime Sponsor requirement was one of the reasons why the Tulsa schools did not want to operate a YETP Program.

Bob: For the sake of discussion, why award academic credit to an in-school YETP youth? After all, he does his work experience after school and is taking classes receiving credits towards graduation during the school day, all of which should mean he does not need academic credit for work experience in YETP.

Karen: One answer to this is that many YETP youth are what I would call "IN-SCHOOL DROPOUTS." They are not going to graduate through the courses they are now taking but possibly would if they got some credit for their YETP work experience. It does not make sense. If the YETP work experience is not tied, in some integrated way, with the youth's total school program, it may encourage rather than discourage school dropouts and thus defeat one of YETP's basic goals -- keeping kids in high school until graduation. To provide credit for YETP work experience is to show the YETP youth that this is part of her/his "regular" school.

Issue: How to get the broader community involved in a total YETP effort

Jorja: The main thing is to get community organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce to understand YETP and to participate. For example, the Chamber of Commerce has a "speaker's bureau"; NAB has an "educator training program"; and Junior League is supporting career education. We need some guidelines from these various kinds of organizations so that they can join forces and work together. If we could get the broader community to understand YETP, we could get much better work sites. One of the things we need to do is to form and conduct a COMMUNITY YETP WORKSHOP. This could be done in the form of several miniconferences, one for each of these community groups.

Karen: AGREE. A possible place to hold such miniconferences would be in the school board's meeting room.

Jim: We have key people in various parts of the State who are members of the Governor's Advisory Council for CETA. We often request, from one of them, a meeting of 12-14 people in the community to discuss CETA. The non-public people (like business person "types") are the hardest to get to attend such meetings. For example, we ran one meeting recently to explain the purposes of PSE to the broader community. We have found that most community members do not understand CETA very well, and that what they think they understand is mostly inaccurate and highly biased in a negative direction.

Jorja: We really need two different types of meetings: (a) a meeting of heads of key organizations to get their commitment; and (b) a meeting of the "gofers" who are going to do the work.

Greg: In Oakland County, we initially sold CETA through our OJT effort. Business persons in a community seem not to know a lot of other people. When we write an OJT contract with one of them, we can tell the Chamber of Commerce his/her name; when business persons hear about OJT from their peers, it is effective.

Jerry: There is the targeted job tax credit incentive around now that might appeal to business people if they knew about it. The question is not how to start the dialogue but, rather, how to maintain it.

Greg: Employers you have dealt with in the past will spread the word, but it is a double-edged sword; i.e., you run into employers you would rather not do business with again. It is easy to publicize the good ones. We go back to the good ones and find them unusually responsive. In terms of the tax credit thing, we have just now reached the point where we understand enough about it so that we are prepared to do something about implementing it.

Joyce: In Tulsa, the business community has been calling in about the tax credit incentive thing, but we have not been given the right information for use in answering their questions.

Jorja: Another thing CETA could do would be to go to State youth meetings and try to make the CETA "pitch." We can get the community to rally around a common concern like "YOUTH AND WORK."

Karen: CETA can be used to promote career education, and career education may be used to help build positive community involvement in CETA. Under P.L. 95-207, it is hoped that career education will expand in Nevada. We need more understanding within education about career education before we may expect to go out into the broader community and seek a true collaborative effort.

Jim: To get over some of CETA's bad press, one of the best things that could happen would be to get a really outstanding CETA program right here in Washington, D.C., where the Congress could see it.

Bob: No matter how good it is, some investigative reporter would find something negative to criticize.

Karen: Local newspaper articles that show how Prime Sponsors and LEAs are working together in the interest of youth may help relieve the "bad press."

Bob: We continually get YETP "success stories" in our local newspapers. Our Prime Sponsor just had its second STATE YOUTH CONFERENCE. All CETA program operators, all county superintendents, and all CBOs were invited to attend.

Lisa: We gave information in this conference on all CETA programs, along with a workshop on how to write a proposal. It was a good exchange opportunity. Most of the funds came from Prime Sponsor CETA funds.

Greg: We have the YOUTH CLEARINGHOUSE run by the Michigan State Bureau of Employment and Training. It was set up to coordinate a variety of youth programs run by the State. It was used as a chance for all Michigan Prime Sponsors to get together. We had small groups on finite topics such as "Work Sites for YETP," etc. There were 11 Prime Sponsors which attended. The meeting was primarily for Prime Sponsor operators. This group plans to have quarterly meetings for Prime Sponsor "types."

The Clearinghouse is valuable because we, the Prime Sponsor "types," had a lot of things we needed to learn that we did not yet know. If we can do this kind of thing and become some kind of "experts," we will be in a better position to get together with other kinds of community organizations later. The whole notion of broader community involvement is fine, BUT, it ought to be done in stages, beginning with the need for each segment to build its own expertise.

Bill: We have a journalist hired by our LEA under the CETA public service job program. This person does a newsletter mailed to all known addresses in the community. The newsletter is published quarterly, 25,000-30,000 copies at a time. We have had very positive feedback on the newsletter from community persons. The newsletter is paid for in part by YETP and in part by Public Services money.

I am now involved in the Governor's grants with reference to the one percent that calls for CETA/LEA linkages. We are thinking about one alternative that would supply, say, $5,000 to every LEA in Michigan that wants to develop a plan for working cooperatively with its CETA Prime Sponsor. To do this would require $2.5 million of the $6.0 million available under this "one percent money." We would then think about using the remainder of these funds to make demonstration grants, on a competitive basis, to those LEAs which are most effective in their plans to work with their Prime Sponsors. This grant competition would be made open to anything that encourages COOPERATION and/or QUALITY OF DELIVERY of each element to youth. This is a preliminary plan and has not been finalized.

Bill: An alternative idea we are talking about is one calling for making planning grants, in the amount of $15,000 each, to one LEA in each Prime Sponsor area followed later by larger demonstration grants. I do not think this second idea would work as well as the first, primarily because of the large number of LEAs which would be discouraged and disappointed by the lack of opportunity to even think about working with their CETA Prime Sponsor.

Jim: With our "one percent money," we are trying to get our three Prime Sponsors together with our State Coordinator of Career Education for purposes of designing some strategies for use of these funds.

Bob and Lisa: We have not done anything with this "one percent money" yet.

Joyce and Jorja: Neither have we in Oklahoma.

Issue: What are good contract negotiation strategies for developing LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements?

Jim: One of the first things that has to be done is to conduct a "miniworkshop" for school superintendents (or their representatives), to let them know CETA's capabilities in career education. We need to listen to their reactions. This would give us an inventory of what is out there in terms of LEA interest, expertise, and resources. This would then let us concentrate on those LEAs with the best capabilities.

A second idea worthy of consideration is that, when a Prime Sponsor is sending out RFPs, it would be good to hold briefing meetings for LEAs before the RFP is formally issued. If LEAs really understand what we are looking for, they are in a much better position to respond.

First of all, however, there is the need to get LEAs together so we can get rid of their fear that the "Feds" are trying to take over from the LEAs and control public education.

Karen: Another thing that could be done would be to try linking the P.L. 95-207 career education monies with available YETP money.

Greg: We have one Prime Sponsor which has put all of its youth programs (YCCIP, SYEP, YETP, etc.) together. The key ingredient in this plan is the Prime Sponsor's strategy of leading each youth toward enrolling in some kind of educational plan; i.e., the youth does not necessarily have to begin training before the plan can work. By using this "gimmick," the Prime Sponsor has been able to get over the CETA restriction that an out-of-school youth can receive no more than 1,000 hours of assistance in one year nor more than 2,000 hours of help in any five-year period. In effect, the Prime Sponsor is able to say that ALL youth are "in-school," thus freeing it from this CETA restriction. I presume that this system has been approved by the Federal government.

Jim: We should have a representative from the Office of the State Coordinator of Career Education involved in the LEA/Prime Sponsor contract negotiation process. That person could represent the SEA as a public relations factor, if nothing else.

Karen: That would also help tie career education and CETA closer together.

Jim: It would also help the linkage concept of the "one percent money." We have a political problem in Nevada now because vocational education is regarded as "the enemy" but career education as a "friend."

Karen: It is important that the persons who will be asked to carry out the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement have the opportunity to become involved in writing it. It is not enough to have only the superintendent of schools representing the LEA.

Joyce: In our RFPs, we make the details very specific, and that is probably a mistake. If we left the RFP a little more open, we would provide some flexibility and allow for a little more creativity on the part of those who have to implement the program.

Karen: AGREE. It would provide for a shared "ownership" which is necessary to get the kind of personal commitment we all seek.

Lisa: Our vocational education contracts tend not to have any kind of narrative that would help people know what and how to carry them out. Primarily, they consist only of budget figures. It would be better if there was some explanatory narrative.

Greg: The problem with contracts is that, during the year, hardly anyone has time to go back and look at what is in the contract. We take a lot of time to write in what we are trying to get by the end of the year in terms of saying how the clients will benefit. In this sense, the contract is obviously important. In spite of this, it does tend to get "filed"; i.e., no one looks at it.

Jim: For our SYEP, we require that work done by the student be "meaningful." We are going to check every two weeks to see if our SYEP enrollees think their work is "meaningful"; if they say it is not, we are going to enforce that part of the contract.

Greg: We have had really positive feedback from the monitoring we did last year. People perceived our monitors as being "helpful" to them.

Karen: It is the same in the classroom. If a school administrator comes in to be helpful to a teacher, he is welcome; but, if he comes to "nit pick" and criticize, he is resented.

Jerry: The big thing is to establish a trust relationship between the program operator and the monitor. Once this relationship is established, even phone calls will help maintain the contacts.

Issue: How to overcome duplication of services among various Federal and State agencies

Bill: We find, at times, that we are trying to provide the same services that our State vocational rehabilitation is trying to provide. With our State Employment Service, we find it is basically going in the direction of serving adults while we are going in the direction of serving youth. But we inevitably overlap; i.e., the Employment Service serves some youth, and we serve some adults.

Jim: We have received a communication recently from something called "GREEN THUMB" which represents some national group concerned with older Americans. We do not know anything about it. We just know a contract has been awarded at the national level and they will shortly be arriving in Nevada. Our Federal representative knows nothing about it.

Greg: Why do Federal representatives not know about things like this when we ask them questions?

Many of us are trying to serve the same population -- i.e., persons with handicaps, ex-offenders, etc. -- but in each case we have to know the person is "eligible" before we can serve her/him. In the case of the handicapped, eligibility determinations are made by the State Vocational Rehabilitation people. The time lag involved can run six months or more.

Bill: I was involved in the writing of a grant to the U.S. Department of Commerce, EDA. One of the advantages was that other agencies knew about our project, as "sign offs" were necessary before I could submit it. This, theoretically, is a service that could be performed in Michigan through our YOUTH CLEARINGHOUSE; but it does not work that way now.

Walter: If you create a system calling for many "sign offs," you run the risk of creating a monster whose complexity will prevent you from getting all necessary signatures prior to the time the grant application deadline is passed. The only way it could work would be if firm deadlines for any agency to sign off were made.

Joyce: We are located in the Tulsa "CITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT," a city department through which flows some of the Federal money coming to Tulsa (CDEG, Economic Development, Aging and CETA). We at least have possibilities for better coordination in planning because the "planners" dealing with these grants work.

The major principle in avoiding duplication of services is to find a way that each agency can see and become convinced that, by joining forces, their clients can be better served AND that they (the agency) will also gain. BOTH ARE IMPORTANT.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 132
Subagreements with Post-Secondary Schools or Community Based Organizations
May 17 and 18, 1979

Participants

Mr. David Wasson
Project Director
Mohave County Career
Education Project
Kingman, Arizona

Mr. Joe A. Baird
Postsecondary Program Coordinator
Division of Special Program
Services
Arizona Department of Education
Phoenix, Arizona

Ms. Cynthia Conwell
Project Director, Triple E
EdCo, Inc.
Brookline, Massachusetts

Ms. Linda Guillerault
Project Coordinator
Newton Area CETA
Newton, Massachusetts

Mr. Marty Ruglis
Coordinator for Special
Instructional Programs
Rensselaer-Columbia-Greene BOCES
Castleton, New York

Mr. Thomas H. Theilman
Rensselaer County Department
of Manpower Development
Troy, New York

Mr. Frederick Kaufman
Superintendent
Plattsmouth Public Schools
Plattsmouth, Nebraska

Ms. Joan Podraza
YETP Coordinator
Balance of State CETA
Lincoln, Nebraska

Mr. Terry Mehail
CETA/YETP Project Counselor
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Observers

Mr. Walter Faulkner
Council of Chief State
School Officers
Washington, D.C.

Mr. William Young
Bureau of Occupational
and Adult Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Saul H. Dulberg
Coordinator of Career
Education
Connecticut State Department
of Education
State Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How can we plan to sustain a YETP program effort after 1980 with CBO involvement?
2. How to develop more LEA trust and understanding of CETA.
3. How to broaden a career emphasis on alternative programs to include more than problem students.
4. How to assure that, at the end of YETP, there will be jobs for youth in high technology industries.
5. How to solve the Fiscal Year problems in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.
6. How to provide advance funds to LEAs for use in YETP LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.
7. How to build more direct communication between the Prime Sponsor and individual LEAs.
8. How to build positive experiences and get more positive perceptions toward YETP youth employed by the LEA.
9. How to use LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements to improve the total educational program.
10. Can LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements come about without the necessity for a third party?
11. How to build a career emphasis in small rural schools.
12. How to find job slots for YETP youth in isolated rural areas.
13. How do you convince small rural communities to provide work experience for "problem kids" -- i.e., for YETP-eligible youth?
14. How can we convince LEAs to give academic credit for YETP work experience?
15. How to convince local rural communities to get over their suspicion of Federal programs.
16. How to encourage CBOs to apply for YCCIP funds.

17. How to overcome community pride factors that prevent the community from identifying YETP-eligible youth.

18. How to recognize and capitalize on benefits for youth growing out of dead-end jobs.

19. How to overcome restrictions growing out of requirements for PSE slots for YETP youth.

20. How to use intermediate units as coordinating agencies for LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

21. How to avoid and/or solve potential competition between LEAs and CBOs for the same youth in YETP programs.

22. How to coordinate YETP programs when kids come from a number of different buildings.

23. How to coordinate CBO YETP efforts with LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.

24. How to help CBOs provide more true employability experiences instead of work training under YETP.

25. How to best integrate YETP and work study slots without making them "first class" and "second class" opportunities.

26. How to develop better Prime Sponsor linkages for CETA with community colleges.

27. How to help both youth and the general public better understand the basic purposes of YETP.

28. How to increase flexibility within LEAs for delivering a good YETP effort.

29. How to improve work site supervision in YETP.

30. How to overcome the paperwork problems involved in getting a YETP effort underway.

31. How to overcome reporting problems in YETP that are discouraging some LEAs from participating.

32. How to get more flexibility in YETP income eligibility requirements.

33. How to improve private sector involvement in YETP.

34. How to coordinate YETP out-of-school and in-school efforts.

35. How to provide flexibility in SYEP and YETP job slots so as to provide more varied opportunities.

36. How to solve teacher union contract problems growing out of fiscal year problems.

37. How best to link YETP and SYEP.

38. How to get a private sector YETP work experience program for rural youth.

39. How do minimum competency tests influence the operation of YETP efforts with respect to academic credit?

40. How to get some commonality in LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements within a given Prime Sponsor Region.

41. How to increase interest and involvement of CBOs in YETP.

42. How to build more community interest and involvement in YETP.

43. How to make YETP a year-round effort.

44. How to reach high school dropouts and get them involved in YETP.

45. How to overcome problems of academic credit related to YETP efforts of CBOs.

46. How to raise goals and aspirations of YETP-eligible youth.

47. How can YETP be used to improve general employability skills and attitudes among YETP youth?

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Dave Wasson and Joe Baird - Phoenix, Arizona

Dave (LEA representative)

We ran a county-wide career education fair, "PATHWAYS 79," this year. The fair was held on a Saturday, and we had 16,000 people come to the county fairgrounds to participate. The public relations effect was terrific. We now have all sorts of community involvement in career education.

The Arizona State Department of Education has an agreement with Balance of State CETA under which CETA specialists in our SEA work directly with LEAs in YETP.

We run a year-round YETP program.

We have three high schools in our county. At each, we have a vocational education teacher assigned as "YETP Coordinator" to work with YETP youth after school and on Saturdays.

In our county, we have one "Vocational Field Coordinator" who spends part-time on YETP and part-time on vocational education.

In our YETP program, we provide:

- o Thirty hours of job survival training in classrooms (for which pay is given). In this training, we use various kinds of assessment and life skills instruments.
- o MRU (Mobile Resource Unit), a trailer van with 13-14 vocational simulation evaluation exercises. This MRU is used as part of our summer YETP program for YETP youth in addition to being used during the year in other parts of our career education program.
- o Labor market data. Broken down by State and local area, this data is made available to our YETP youth in special sessions.
- o Basic academic skills. Regular classroom teachers help provide YETP youth with these skills as part of their regular teaching.

Because YETP uses income as the prime criterion for eligibility, we get some highly gifted kids enrolling as well as some who are less academically talented.

Our three local "YETP Coordinators" visit our YETP job sites weekly.

We developed job shadowing for YETP in the private sector as a 25-hour experience. Some of these youth become employed by those they "shadowed" and so drop out of YETP, which we take as one measure of success.

We try to "custom build" our YETP work site slots to fit with the career interests of each YETP youth, not the reverse of making YETP youth fit into existing slots.

Last year, it worked out that we had an almost equal number of YETP youth in each of the three communities in our county. This year, we have a disproportionate number from only one of these three communities. This can create a potential "community jealousy" problem.

It is difficult to find out what happens to YETP enrollees after they finish YETP. We are currently using evaluative criteria related to the number of enrollees who find unsubsidized jobs in the private sector; these are hard data to collect.

Joe (Prime Sponsor representative)

Phoenix and Tuscon have 85 percent of Arizona's population, and so each city has its own Prime Sponsor. The rest is in CETA Balance of State.

On our SEA staff, we have persons employed to provide technical assistance to all Prime Sponsors in Arizona.

We also handle the "6 percent CETA training money" through the vocational education division in our SEA.

Recently, I was appointed to the CETA Planning Council of our local Phoenix Prime Sponsor. In the first meeting I attended, I was made Chairman of the Delivery Systems Review Committee. The role of the CETA Planning Council _is_ a problem that should be discussed.

We have had a very successful State effort in "marrying" vocational education, career education, and CETA Prime Sponsor dollars in a cooperative program. Using these "married dollars," we have started 20 new cooperative education programs. This requires a lot of planning. Students in one of these programs spend one-half day in academic/remedial work and one-half day in work experience. In Phoenix alone, we were able to take on 300 youth who would not have been enrolled in our traditional cooperative education program.

Tax credits are now available for private sector involvement, but we do not know enough about how to take advantage of this.

Questions and Answers

Q - Did you pay your YETP enrollee you described who was "shadowing" a veterinarian for 25 hours?
A - Yes, it was a 25-hour agreement.

Q - Do you have a series of jobs available for "shadowing"?
A - No. We can arrange almost anything. We are trying to get away from having YETP youth exposed only to the kinds of jobs we have available around the school.

Q - How does the SEA enter into making the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement for Balance of State?
A - The SEA negotiates the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement for Balance of State and then works with local LEAs in carrying it out.

Q - How were you able to make YETP into a year-round program?
A - Because we have one YETP coordinator on a 12-month salary, he can work full-time with YETP youth during the summer. Under our plan, we can interchange YETP slots with SYEP slots so as to best meet needs of kids ranging in age from 14 through 19.

Terry Mehail - Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Terry (Prime Sponsor representative)

For many years, our LEA was deeply involved with CETA in the NYC program.

We started YETP last year and had to overcome difficulties associated with a strike that held up our getting started as smoothly as we would have liked.

We used to have YETP in our Pupil Personnel Department but have now decided to take it out and put it into either "guidance" or "special needs."

We have found a big discrepancy between what YETP offers and what responsibilities of employers are.

For many years, we have had, in Wisconsin, a layer of vocational-technical schools superimposed on our regular public school system and operating primarily on the postsecondary level. Our regular high schools saw their prime goals as preparing kids for entry either into college or into postsecondary vocational-technical education. As a result, we have had trouble providing adequate YETP programs for in-school youth in high schools having no vocational education programs. That is being changed at the present time.

In our YETP Summer Project last year, we had six counselors doing work site visitations. With 120-130 work sites, this was a tough thing to do. This summer, we plan to add a class that will meet two hours a day for five days per week called our "WORK OPPORTUNITIES COURSE." It will be a combination self/career assessment course, and we will try to encourage our YETP youth to enroll in it.

We have been successful in having all our YETP youth enroll in the Wisconsin Job Service.

We follow-up our LEA graduates (all of them) under a systematic follow-up plan in existence prior to YETP. We are now using that system to follow-up YETP youth as well as others. This system gives us about an 85 percent return rate on our inquiries.

Each time a counselor goes out to one of our YETP work sites, he/she fills out a report of what was observed and discussed with the work site supervisor. We have had some problems, at times, with YETP youth dropping out of the work experience portion of YETP without their employers notifying us. We are now correcting this.

We do work values/career decision-making kinds of things with YETP youth after school hours as a part of our total career education program. We have two hours each week of after-hours classroom training for our YETP youth. This training is viewed as part of their 15 hours of weekly work experience.

Some of our YETP youth are in our regular cooperative education program. The problem is that, to be in our regular cooperative education program, the youth need some kinds of vocational skills; and some YETP youth do not have any.

Each school has two vocational counselors who are to find part-time jobs for potential dropouts in the private sector. The counselors visit each of these youth nine hours every six weeks. (Note: this is in addition to our YETP effort.) These kids can get two hours of work experience credit (which counts toward high school graduation).

"EXPLORING FOR WORK OPPORTUNITIES" is an LEA summer program open to all youth that provides one hour of credit toward graduation. It has been established and paid for by our LEA. We are considering running two of these courses for YETP youth this coming summer.

YETP youth in Milwaukee get some help both from our local Jewish Vocational Service and from our vocational school.

All YETP youth in our in-school program must take courses required for high school graduation. If, for example, they are low in reading, they can take remedial reading in summer school.

Questions and Answers

Q - Do you let kids who have left YETP for the private sector come back into YETP if they leave those private sector jobs?
A - Yes.

Q - What is the problem with your vocational-technical center?
A - It is no problem, except that it has kept us from having a strong vocational education emphasis in our regular high schools.

Q - Do you find resistance to your YETP counselors not being on your regular staff?
A - No. Our YETP counselors are regular LEA counselors who take on YETP as an additional assignment. We have one counselor during the school year and six during the summer paid by YETP funds. During the regular school year, our regular counselors do a lot of counseling with YETP youth as a part of their normal job and are not paid extra for doing it.

Q - Who pays for the YETP career decision-making kinds of things you do with YETP youth in after-school hours?
A - YETP. It is a kind of "moonlighting" thing for the four counselors involved.

Q - What is your role in the Milwaukee school system?
A - I supervise all counselors in our school system.

Q - Do you have parent involvement in YETP?
A - We make some home visits.

Joan Podraza and Fred Kaufman - Nebraska

Fred (LEA representative)

We have a number of CETA programs in our LEA including YCCIP, adult CETA, SYEP, and YETP. Our CETA Prime Sponsor representative relates directly with the vocational counselor in our LEAs.

We have a vocational job coordinator who runs our regular vocational education program. She also works with YETP kids. If they are enrolled in her program, these YETP kids receive academic credit for YETP experiences.

The work experience our YETP kids get is primarily within our LEA. There, the kids do a variety of kinds of helpful jobs which, in addition to providing direct help to our LEA, provide these kids with good work habits and work attitudes. Use of YETP in such work experiences as custodial assignments is not a problem to us. We have some YETP youth who come from homes where neither the mother nor the father works. If we can teach these kids good work habits, YETP will certainly be a worthwhile program.

By doing our YETP work experience within our LEA, we do not have to take jobs away from other employed adults. Instead, we have had work done that we could not possibly have had money to pay others to do. It is needed, useful, productive work, but there is no way our regular school budget would have allowed us to hire others to do it.

Joan (Prime Sponsor representative)

We have some general conditions for any kind of YETP work experience in our Balance of State LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. If an LEA is not willing to abide by these conditions, we do not sign an agreement. We use a form on which work site supervisors record what the YETP enrollees do. This record of accomplishment is used as one basis for deciding on the award of academic credit for YETP work experience.

YETP, for us, is a year-round program. It is coordinated with SYEP under a plan that begins with surveying all YETP kids for purposes of discovering which ones want to participate in SYEP. (We also coordinate YCCIP with SYEP.) By keeping our "near poor" kids on YETP during the summer, we are able to put our most economically disadvantaged YETP youth into SYEP slots. Our severely economically disadvantaged YETP seniors are put into adult CETA slots during the summer. In this way, we are able to keep some "near poor" kids in YETP, in spite of the fact that they are not quite poor enough to meet the more stringent poverty requirements of SYEP.

We have a career development plan for each YETP youth. This plan calls for statements of both short-term and long-term career goals.

We have kids working 10 hours a week during the school year. About one hour per week of that time is spent on classroom activities, including occupational information.

We have found that 14-15 year olds cannot get very good jobs, primarily because of the child labor laws. This is one of our problems. We need to get some jobs for these kids so we can get to them before they get into trouble. It would be far better than to do remedial work for 17-19 year olds.

We are insisting that all our work site supervisors view the Department of Labor film "DON'T JUST SIT THERE." It is a very good teaching tool for helping work site supervisors understand their roles and responsibilities.

For labor market information, we have YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES UNLIMITED (YOU), which is open to SYEP kids as well as to others. YOU is located close to us on the Strategic Air Command Air Force Base. The YOU program consists of one week of career exploration including one full day of job shadowing.

Questions and Answers

Q - Are you currently keeping your 14-15 year olds out of YETP?
A - Yes. Some of them are in SYEP.

Q - Do you have YETP paid staff in your LEA?
A - No, only those working on YCCIP, not on YETP.

Q - How does your individual career development plan for each YETP kid work?
A - We have a manpower specialist from the Prime Sponsor who helps each YETP kid fill out this form. The LEAs are not involved in this process.

Q - Do you have YETP kids getting work experience in your LEA on bus maintenance?
A - No, but we could. One boy will be helping on school vehicle maintenance and bus maintenance during the summer in YETP.

Q - How do you determine how many YETP slots are to be given to each LEA?
A - We get data from such sources as lists of kids who get free lunches, food stamps, etc. Using such lists, we are able to give tentative slot allotments to each county. This "slot problem" exists only in the summer. During the summer, slot allotments are assigned from our administrative office. During the regular school year, we proceed on the basis of nominations received from LEAs of youth who they believe will be YETP-eligible.

Q - Do you use your State Employment Service for YETP eligibility screening?
A - Only in the summer program.

Linda Guillerault and Cynthia Conwell - Newton, Massachusetts

Cynthia (LEA representative)

EdCo (Education Collaborative for Greater Boston) began in 1969, as a private, non-profit corporation, established and convened by local school systems. EdCo membership includes 13 public school systems and the Archdiocese of Boston. The agency is governed by a Board of Directors comprised of the superintendents of schools, a school committee member from each EdCo public school system, and the superintendent of the Boston Archdiocesan Schools. As a result, EdCo was in a unique position to move quickly to develop a YETP plan.

EdCo linked LEA jurisdictions with CETA jurisdictions through an Advisory Committee of schools and CETA people to discuss the new YEDPA legislation in general and YETP/LEAs in particular. We have three YETP contracts involving LEA/CETA agreements.

Our EEE (Triple E) program, as part of EdCo, is an alternative high school education program based primarily on a combination of basic education and work experience. Youth come into this program as recommended by CETA personnel, school counselors and/or social service agencies. In all cases, the youth must ultimately be approved by the school which grants his/her academic credit; this is something done by the LEAs from which the YETP youth come.

In addition to a project director, we coordinate our YETP sites through our Resource Center with the aid of a full-time job developer, school coordinator and counselor liaison.

At our alternative school site itself, we have 91 YETP enrollees with five teachers and three job counselors. Three of these teachers are there on loan from their LEAs, with substitute teachers back there now being paid for by EdCo.

The program is basically a one week school/one week work program so that, at any given time, only half of the YETP kids are in the school while the other half are out in work experience. Thus, we are able to "flip flop" jobs, allowing us to assure employers that someone will be with them all the time. This has allowed us to increase the quality of YETP work sites. Initially, we developed about 100 job sites. It is very hard to develop YETP work sites in high-technology areas.

Job counselors work closely with YETP students, including spending a great deal of time at the work site.

Work site agreements are made individually for each YETP youth. Each agreement is very specific in terms of expected responsibilities and actions on the part of the youth and the work site supervisor. There is a career development plan developed for each YETP enrollee.

Initially, there was an attempt made to integrate academic and work site experiences by having teachers as well as the counselors visit the work sites. However, we found it necessary to drop this idea because our work site supervisors were getting confused about who is responsible for what in work site supervision.

Linda (Prime Sponsor representative)

Six of our 10 local communities are participating in our EdCo LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. All students who come into our CETA office speak to a youth counselor. We have a variety of CETA services available to students and try to find something appropriate for each one. YETP is one of these options. As a CETA representative, my relationship with EdCo is basically an administrative one. We are trying to make sure that we do not get overlap and duplication.

Cynthia (LEA representative)

We are trying to change the image of our alternative program as one only for "problem kids." It is really an innovative kind of educational experience that could potentially be of benefit to many kids in addition to those labeled as "problem kids." For example, we can take kids into our program at any time during the school year; each kid begins with us by engaging in a Self Directed Search exercise. We have a completely non-graded situation with no "straight curriculum." It is highly individualized and designed to accommodate the unique needs of each student.

We started in January, 1978. Our program includes both an academic year and a summer program. Our summer program consists of two three-week sessions.

Questions and Answers

Q - How do you handle your planning for next fall's operation?
A - We simply assume we will be funded. In addition, we are very much aware of the need to prepare students for a possible and/or eventual transition back to their home high school. Although we perceive our program as a "transition program", because most students will never make this transition, it is very difficult to maintain this idea with school personnel. Their home high school gets to count them as their students (in terms of State and local financial aid) even when they are with us.

Q - Are your EdCo physical facilities designed differently from a regular high school?

A - Yes. We are currently in a G.S.A. site operated by the Army Corp of Civil Engineers. Our classrooms are part of a barrack type wing which is currently one of the few wings which the Corp is not using for its offices. Shortly, we hope to have our program in office-type space.

Q - How many students do you have in your YETP program?

A - We have 81 YETP slots in our EEE program, which operates as an independent part of EdCo.

Q - With the CETA four percent limit on administrative costs, is there a problem here for you?

A - No. We have many kinds of Federal grants so that the salary of a given person may be spread over several of these. Thus, only a small portion of the salary needs to be assigned to any given project.

Q - Do you have a problem inservicing your work site monitors?

A - Yes, on occasion. When the problem is such that the individual youth's job counselor cannot work out a particular problem, the Resource Center job developer acts as a facilitator.

Q - How can you expect to have other than "problem kids" if you say that you are an "alternative school"?

A - Not everyone who is labeled as "no problem" in a local LEA can be said not to be in need of remedial education. Some of these "no problem" kids do need the kind of individual attention and help we are able to provide.

Q - How do you help your potential high school dropouts see themselves realistically?

A - We depend on the skills, interest, understanding, and commitment of the staff member, be it counselor, teacher, or some other person, who can and does relate best with the particular youth.

Q - Linda, do you have LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements with some individual LEAs which are not part of EdCo?

A - We have a separate agreement with the other four LEAs in our CETA consortium.

Marty Ruglis and Tom Theilman - Castleton, New York

Tom (Prime Sponsor representative)

We wanted to run an in-school YETP program and to help lots of kids see work/education relationships. We, as the CETA Prime Sponsor, approached our local BOCES (Board of Cooperative Education Services), after having offered the opportunity to all school districts to do our in-school program. Our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement is with our BOCES, and we regard this BOCES as an "LEA." The BOCES does the actual work in YETP.

We have 110 YETP kids in the "career employment experiences" portion of YETP and over 1,000 kids in "transition services" getting general employability skills. (NOTE: Many of these 1,000 are not economically disadvantaged.)

Marty (LEA representative)

In our YETP "career employment experience" program, we have 110-125 work experience slots for in-school YETP youth. Slots are given out initially according to school populations in each LEA. We have two full-time counselors who make weekly contacts with each of these YETP youth and visit them at their work sites. In addition, these counselors devote one to one and one-half hours weekly to general career development work with each YETP youth.

Youth are referred to our YETP program by a local school official, an administrator, counselor, teacher, etc. We in BOCES do the YETP eligibility certification. All of our cooperating LEAs provide us with space within the LEA to do counseling as needed for each YETP youth.

YETP youth are eligible to use the regular placement program services in our BOCES, in addition to the YETP courses set up for vocational education.

YETP youth checks are delivered to YETP youth each pay day by their counselors, which is one very effective way of encouraging YETP youth to come in for counseling.

In PROJECT AWARE PROGRAM (YETP "transition services"), we have three full-time counselors. This project operates in every high school (except one) in the county. There are 41 "lessons" involved in this total program. Lessons 1-10 consist of the Career Motivation Project; 11-31 concern job-seeking and decision-making skills; and lessons 32-41 are devoted to job-keeping skills. Initially targeted for seniors, the program has now expanded to serve 10th and 11th graders.

We utilize value clarification materials in this project, along with heavy doses of job seeking/finding/getting/holding skills. We use life skills materials and career exploration simulation packages.

In some high schools, there is an overlap in these two programs (work experience and PROJECT AWARE), with some youth enrolled both in our "career employment experiences" work experience program and in PROJECT AWARE.

Some youth have been through PROJECT AWARE twice now (because of the overlap). Because the project was run somewhat differently, depending on the instructional staff, the youth have gained each time they have gone through it.

Questions and Answers

Q - Did your BOCES exist prior to the time YETP began?
A - Yes. BOCES has existed since about 1944.

Q - Are your counselors in PROJECT AWARE all paid for with YETP funds?
A - Yes.

Q - Are all of your YETP career employment experience kids also in PROJECT AWARE?
A - Most, but not all.

Q - How much of the equipment which you use in PROJECT AWARE is paid for by YETP?
A - Only the software. All the hardware we use is owned by our BOCES, except for some filing cabinets and desks.

Q - Does PROJECT AWARE extend down to cover 14-15 year olds?
A - No, but we are trying to make it cover Grades 10-11. We believe PROJECT AWARE can make a YETP youth more ready for a "career employment experience" in the 10th or 11th grade.

Q - Do you find that LEAs are more closely supervised by CETA Prime Sponsors than are CBOs?
A - We do not have any CBOs in our county which are currently under contract.

Q - What percent of YETP in-school funds is BOCES getting from the CETA Prime Sponsor in your county?
A - 100 percent.

TWO ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to improve private sector involvement in YETP.
- How to help both youth and the general public better understand the basic purposes of YETP.

Issue: How to improve private sector involvement in YETP

Dave: In smaller communities, there are a number of small non-profit organizations ready to set up YETP work stations in "government-type" jobs. These jobs are not as "real" as in the "real world" of private enterprise. I would like to get more YETP youth out in the private sector where they could understand that a profit must be made and that something other than service is needed to make the world go around. We cannot train kids just to expect to get paid by the government.

Joan: For 12th graders, we use the youth OJT (The YOJT component of YETP in which we reimburse the private employer half the wages for six months) up to 1,149 hours. We find the youth's interests and then try to match those interests with jobs available from employers in the private sector. Under these conditions, wages paid are dependent on the prevailing apprentice wage. For example, if a youth is an apprentice carpenter at $4.00 per hour, CETA reimburses the employer $2.00 per hour.

The new tax break incentive also helps here. After we find the youth and the matching employer, we tell the employer we are going to save him money in two ways:
(a) we (CETA) will pay half the youth's salary; and
(b) the employer can get a tax break.

During the regular school year, the youth can work 20 hours per week; during the summer, 40 hours per week. NOTE: Because it is Youth OJT (YOJT) rather than adult OJT, it can be a part-time position during the regular school year.

Cynthia: Getting all the approvals we needed for that type of position to be classified as "upgrading" was a very discouraging process. If this is not the same with YOJT, I can see where it might work.

Linda: We have tried OJT for out-of-school youth but it did not work very well because: (a) employers did not want to hire school dropouts and (b) school dropouts, by and large, were not motivated enough.

We have contracted with a local regional vocational school to run vocational skill training on the job where youth rotate among a number of occupations within a given occupational cluster. It is kind of a "job shadowing" arrangement, except that kids really do some productive work. Because these youth go to the job site with a vocational teacher and under his/her supervision, it is called "training" instead of "employment." We are paying these out-of-school youth "wages" instead of "allowances" because the other aspect of their program is work experience. It is really a career exploration program for out-of-school youth.

Terry: There is another problem. In Wisconsin, a kid technically is not "out of school" until age 18, so we cannot talk about a YETP "out-of-school" program for the LEA. There are too many CBOs taking care of these kids, and we do not want to compete with them. CBOs can do it, after all, cheaper than we can.

Marty: If we can use YOJT in a sequential program that begins with a YETP youth who develops some basic work attitudes through an initial PSE YETP experience, we may be able to show the private sector employer that this student is ready for a place of employment -- *i.e., think of PSE YETP as a pre-private sector kind of experience*.

Cynthia: We do not have any more trouble placing youth in our Entitlement private sector program than in the YETP public sector program. We provide for both programs highly supportive services which are aimed at helping kids succeed in their work experiences, in particular, the out-of-school private sector kids.

Joe: Would it not be an advantage to the LEA if you could take "out-of-school" youth and make them (at least in a paper sense) "in-school" youth? If so, LEAs would not talk about an "out-of-school" YETP effort, only about "in-school YETP".

Joan: In our YOJT program we had, for example, one kid who worked for a local radio station. He started out learning about the station, doing odd jobs, and later writing up ads for them. He then started reading ads on the radio and wound up with his own disc jockey show. He is now at the University of Nebraska majoring in Communications Broadcasting and has decided on broadcasting as a career. We regarded what he was doing as "career preparation," but you certainly could think of it, in YETP terms, as "career exploration."

Another example was a boy who wanted to be an auto mechanic. We found out that he was good at art projects, using his hands to build things. There was an auto body repair shop in his small town of 150 persons. The owner took this boy on and trained him in auto body. The employer said he much preferred this to taking a kid out of a two-year vocational-technical program; i.e., he would rather train him himself. This particular youth is going to work, under YETP, in this auto body shop for one year in order to test and confirm his career decision and to acquire some initial vocational skills. As an 11th grader, he will work there 20 hours per week during the school year and 40 hours per week during the summer. He is getting academic credit for this work experience.

Joe: Does the tax write-off in YETP depend on it starting at the beginning of the tax year?

Tom: We have all our paper work done to go into the tax credit incentive thing. To do so, we first approached our State Department of Labor (which has all the forms) and set up a non-financial agreement with it. Our agreement said the Prime Sponsor would do the youth eligibility requirement part and the local Employment Service would certify that the prospective employer is eligible as a bonafide employer. Each person (whether a CETA youth or adult) would be responsible for locating his/her own full-time job. We regarded this arrangement not as a part of YETP, but rather as an extension of YETP -- i.e., as a means to get into a full-time job after the youth had completed the YETP program.

Terry: It comes back to a kind of "electoral college" concept -- i.e., how closely are you being audited? We have got to be very, very careful in Milwaukee so as to follow all CETA rules and regulations exactly. There is no way we could do what Joan is doing in rural Nebraska. That is, we could not have a kid go in and actually work in the private sector because it would be construed to mean that he/she is taking a job away from some unemployed adult.

Linda: AGREE. In our program, we must consider the youth to be "in training" rather than "at work," in spite of the fact that the youth are engaged in productive activities in the private sector.

Cynthia: AGREE. We need to have someone on the staff who is very sensitive to union problems. In many places, to put kids in the private sector will involve negotiations with the union as well as with the employer.

Fred: Are we talking about taking the "best" kids and putting them in the private sector and leaving the "rest" to work in PSE slots, such as jobs in my school system? If so, what does that do to the image of a kid who builds a reputation as a "CETA kid who has been through PSE?"

Joan: We can and should use PSE to certify to some private sector employers that, through YETP PSE work experience, we have been able to make a particular youth "job ready" in terms of good work habits and work attitudes.

Cynthia: The advantage of private sector work experience is that we can more readily guarantee job placement at the end; for our PSE slots we cannot, with few exceptions, have this guarantee. It is important, under either private sector or PSE work experience, to give youth an opportunity to change work experiences at least every three months.

Issue: How to help both youth and the general public better understand the basic purposes of YETP

Joe Where distrust exists, some mechanism needs to be developed to get the parties together. At the State level in Arizona, periodic meetings are conducted to orient staff to the basic purposes of YETP. Field staff are much more knowledgeable about CETA programs than most SEA program directors, since field staff have direct contact with CETA Prime Sponsors and receive technical assistance from SEA staff responsible for this function. Staff from the Balance of State Prime Sponsor (Governor's Office of Economic Planning and Development) have also made presentations at our state staff meetings.

Terry: In the mind of the general public, "CETA" is not divided into "in-school" and "out-of-school" projects. We would be better off in YETP if we completely separated YETP from the CETA adult programs.

Fred: DISAGREE. We never use the term "YETP." Instead, we call our programs "CETA" no matter what part they are. We have a large advisory council and try to play up all the positive things we do in all our CETA programs. I try to show how much higher our tax levy would be, for example, if it were not for the availability of CETA dollars. This year, without CETA, our school taxes would be two mills higher.

Dave: DISAGREE WITH FRED. We never use the word "CETA." Instead, all we talk about is "YETP." Since I work through our SEA, I do not even think in terms of CETA or the Department of Labor.

Terry: We have had problems in that some of the adult CETA money has been misspent in the past. Those practices preceded our YETP efforts and caused some in the general public to look at us with distrust and suspicion.

Cynthia: In Boston, the negative ideas are with adult PSE slots set up to do political things. There really has not been active criticism of CETA youth programs. We need to zero in on positive publicity for good SYEP programs; lots of them now in operation could counteract the bad example given in the infamous "60 Minutes" program.

Dave: We ought to go to ABC and NBC and ask them to do a counterpart reply to the CBS "60 Minutes" program on CETA.

Joe: Part of the poor public image may be simply that many members of the general public still have a negative image of vocational education; because they associate CETA youth programs with vocational education, they are automatically against them.

Hazel: Every time I am in the Department of Labor, I find a bunch of very sharp young people who mean very well and try very hard but who have had no real practical experience in education and so do not understand LEAs well or how CETA Prime Sponsors and LEAs should, and could, work together. We need to try to help these good, young persons in the Department of Labor.

Linda: On a local level, it is easier for me to develop a rapport with LEAs if they can see me (CETA Prime Sponsor representative) as a legitimate agency. When they see me caught with restrictions that prevent me from making firm commitments to them or giving them straight answers, I lose credibility. I need more freedom from "higher up" in the Department of Labor structure.

As a CBO/LEA contractor, we do not concern the LEA with fiscal/refunding problems. Instead, we deal with these "problems" as a separate entity so that they do not interfere with the daily operation of the program, especially since we are involved with so many school systems.

Terry: We wanted to hire two new counselors for this coming September but find we will have to hire them simply "on faith" because the YETP money will not be coming in until October.

Marty: We really lose credibility, if we go to LEAs and tell them "You have 10 YETP slots; please identify some kids and we will let you know when you can start" and then go back later and tell them "Sorry, we do not have those slots after all."

Tom: We have tried to cover ourselves by putting some carryover money in our September budget.

Terry: Each year, by September 15, we have to give enrollment figures for each school in our LEA. Those figures determine staffing at each school. If we have "x" number of kids programmed for "work experience," it can make a difference of one or two teachers. When we do not know where we stand with reference to YETP, it is very tough.

Joan: Our negative things are centered around the general distrust of the "Feds." With us, finance is not the problem.

Linda: DISAGREE. Many of the public relations problems in YETP are tied to financial difficulties and uncertainties.

Marty: Part of the problem is that the kids served by YETP are not the sons and daughters of the community's "power structure." Members of the "power structure" tend to say that they want jobs for their kids, too. That is part of the advantage of our PROJECT AWARE, which includes services to kids of all economic levels.

Tom: If YETP goes well now, we should not have so many problems 10 years from now with adult unemployment. We could, perhaps, play up with the general public the preventive potential of YETP. Maybe we could sell it on that basis.

Tom: We have had some suggestions to use CETA participants with public relations potential and assign them to work experience slots that would consist of searching for, writing up, and publicizing local CETA "success stories." This might be another approach to use in building a positive image.

Terry: We have a "School of Performing Arts" in Milwaukee as part of our school system. We are going to have some YETP kids, through their work experience, put on a play for kids in elementary schools aimed at increasing their career awareness. These YETP youth are all ones whose tentative career choices are in the field of the performing arts, so this is legitimate work experience for them and very good public relations for YETP as they perform this needed service for elementary school children.

Joe: We could have a cadre of YETP youth who are having really good career exploration experiences and pay them to go around to local civic groups to tell them about their positive experiences.

Cynthia: DISAGREE. There is something wrong with publicizing the success stories of "CETA kids." It is almost like saying, "We agree that many of them are no good at all but here are some exceptions." We ought to be very careful about what we do here. Besides, to focus too much on any one kid may not be good for that kid.

Joan: AGREE WITH CYNTHIA. I would really feel sorry for a successful YETP kid if too many people came in to observe him. He would start feeling like an "animal in the zoo."

Marguerite: I have a grand idea. We could take pictures of YETP "success kids" and then have the CETA Prime Sponsor representative and the LEA YETP person do joint presentations to local civic groups of various kinds.

Marty: We have used our BOCES counselors to make this kind of civic club presentation, but we have not taken Prime Sponsor representatives in with us as a part of the presentation team. We certainly could include them.

LEA/CETA COLLABORATION FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Miniconference 133
YETP In-School Programs in Rural Areas
May 22 and 23, 1979

Participants

Ms. Linda Phelps
School Counselor
Russell County Board of Education
Jamestown, Kentucky

Mr. Maurice (Maurey) Fritch
Vocational Director
St. Clair County Intermediate
School District
Marysville, Michigan

Mr. Stan Townsend
Education Coordinator
Roosevelt Center
Service Employment and
Redevelopment
Jobs for Progress
Casper, Wyoming

Mr. Concepcion (Con) Beltran
Administrator for EMP Program
Department of Education Office
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico

Ms. Ann Six
CETA Youth Programs
Bureau of Manpower Services
CETA Operations Branch
Frankfort, Kentucky

Mr. Chris Polyhronos
St. Clair County Manpower
Youth Coordinator
Port Huron, Michigan

Ms. Cathy Ramirez
YETP Coordinator
Roosevelt Center
Service Employment and
Redevelopment
Jobs for Progress
Casper, Wyoming

Ms. Virgilina (Lina) Lucca
Director of Teachers
Administration
Department of Education Office
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico

Mr. James Dasher
Supervisor, Exemplary Programs
State Department of Education
Arkansas Department of Education
Little Rock, Arkansas

Observers

Ms. Dee Shaw
Office of Career Education
Michigan Department of Education
Lansing, Michigan

Ms. Maria Morrero
Office of Career Education
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Marion Starr
State Supervisor of
Career Education
Department of Elementary
and Secondary Education
Jefferson City, Missouri

Dr. Joe Scherer
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

ISSUES RAISED BY PARTICIPANTS

1. How to solve the funding cycle problems in making LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.
2. How to help LEAs become more involved in planning LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.
3. How to get over lack of understanding and lack of support for Department of Labor youth programs on the part of educators in local school districts.
4. How to encourage Prime Sponsors to make agreements with more LEAs.
5. How to get a Department of Labor reporting system that is more compatible with LEA reporting capability.
6. How to get more meaningful work experiences for YETP participants that go beyond menial jobs.
7. How to help Prime Sponsors understand how career education can be integrated into the YETP program.
8. How to get private employers more involved in YETP.
9. How to encourage LEAs to adapt school schedules so as to help solve the funding problem.
10. How to blend Department of Labor services into the school setting in a more effective and efficient way.
11. How to keep track of LEA career activities over a geographic area served by one Prime Sponsor.
12. How to help Prime Sponsors work more effectively with both the Intermediate School District (ISD) and local school districts in a fair and efficient way.
13. How to find the right people in the LEA to really make the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement work.
14. How to get productive and meaningful work experience for youth with no specific vocational skills.
15. How to solve the CETA red tape problems.
16. How to help educators learn what they need to know about CETA.

17. How to help LEA and Prime Sponsor representatives work together as a community team.

18. How to find economically disadvantaged kids eligible for YETP.

19. How to put a job survival emphasis into YETP.

20. How to use YETP as a vehicle for keeping kids from leaving high school.

21. How to help overcome the community distrust of the "Feds" with reference to new programs.

22. How to get interagency understanding of YETP among Prime Sponsors and educators at both the State and local levels.

23. How to solve the personnel turnover problem in YETP.

24. How to educate school counselors with respect to the academic credit problem and to help Prime Sponsors understand this problem.

25. How to help Prime Sponsors solve both their short-term and long-term planning problems.

26. How to interest local communities in YETP.

27. How to get more LEAs involved in YETP.

DESCRIPTIONS OF COMMUNITY YETP PROGRAMS

Maurey Fritch and Chris Polyhronos - Port Huron, Michigan

Chris (Prime Sponsor Representative)

"Youth" have been designated as a significant segment in our CETA programs -- including our OJT, vocational training, in-school work experience, and YCCIP work.

We use Title II-B of CETA and YETP combined to make our in-school work experience program. This effort includes both the "transition services" and the work experience under the "career employment experiences" portion. The six staff members maintain YETP, YCCIP, II-B, and summer programs. Career Employment Experience is an underlying goal in all programs and is addressed in the LEA agreement under YETP.

Jobs under YETP are in the "public sector" not "PSE." (The Department of Labor defines each differently.) Unemployed out-of-school youth are also in YCCIP and PSE. We maintain a flexible YETP work/career employment experience program, in order to serve special needs youth, such as juvenile offenders and handicapped youth.

Maurey (LEA representative)

In January, 1977, we implemented a joint program of transition services for CETA-eligible youth only. The program included: (a) occupational interests, (b) occupational information survey, and (c) employability skills training. Under this program, students with special problems could be referred to our vocational assessment center and receive further help there.

In 1977, our LEA Intermediate Unit SKILL CENTER operated a YETP summer youth vocational training program which provided enrollees with general employability skills, occupational information, etc.

THIS YEAR, we implemented the MACOMB CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM with both a junior high component and a senior high program. Junior high students used the Michigan Occupational Information System to develop tentative career goals and a plan for courses they will take in high school. Ninth and tenth grade youth used this program to further develop tentative career plans. We spent over $14,000 to buy microfiche readers and MACOMB CAREER DEVELOPMENT materials for use with the Michigan Occupational Information System in this program. We have made these materials available to 5,000 of our students, not just those who are YETP-eligible.

THIS YEAR, then, we are only operating what YETP calls "transition services," which makes it possible for us to serve ALL of our students. This summer, under SYEP, we will plan to bring students into our two CAREER RESOURCE CENTERS to obtain occupational information. This will be combined with field trips into the business/industry community.

The Prime Sponsor representative, not the LEA, determines who is "YETP-eligible." In our agreement, the CETA Prime Sponsor operates the "career employment experiences" part of YETP independent of the school system, including paying student wages. The LEAs are involved only in "transition services" on a contractual basis with the Prime Sponsor.

We had a career fair two weeks ago for all 8th graders. We had Prime Sponsor representatives who sat in on the planning board for this event.

We are combining the SEA's "career education professional development funds" in order to pay teachers to go through YETP Youth Inservice Education Training. We regard YETP simply as part of our county-wide career education effort.

Questions and Answers

Q - What kind of a vocational assessment laboratory do you have?
A - We use a work sample system. It was originally intended to serve persons with handicaps and those with limited reading ability.

Q - How does the "career employment experience" part of your YETP program work?
A - The Prime Sponsor has a non-financial agreement under which the LEAs give academic credit for either work experience or cooperative education. The work experience slots are developed by the Prime Sponsor and are all in the public sector.

Q - Is YCCIP, in your operation, primarily for out-of-school youth?
A - Yes. We use it as a full-time program for high school dropouts.

Q - Who hires the YETP counselors?
A - The Prime Sponsor. These counselors work well with the LEA school counselors.

Q - Does a school counselor have to certify that the YETP work experience is related to the youth's career goals?
A - Yes.

Jim Dasher - Little Rock, Arkansas

Jim (SEA representative)

We started a "YETP-like" youth emphasis way back in MDTA days when Arkansas decided to put its "five percent funds" into "new and innovative programs." We have 23 post-secondary vocational-technical schools in Arkansas (with bus routes for every person), nine area vocational high schools, and 382 LEAs.

Instead of the Prime Sponsor Balance of State developing LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements with each LEA, this task has been contracted, by the Prime Sponsor, to the Arkansas State Department of Education's Division of Vocational Education.

Our PHASE 36 PROGRAM is for high school dropouts under YETP. We put them through one of our Singer "career awareness labs." (We have 20 of these in portable trailers plus some permanently stationed ones.) As a result of this experience, we try to help each youth decide on one of the following options: (a) return to high school; (b) enroll in a vocational-technical school; (c) enlist in the military service; or (d) become employed in an unsubsidized job in the private sector.

We have been able to affiliate this program with National VICA to hold "PHASE 36 VICA Contests." We have one Phase 36 YETP coordinator in each of the 18 schools.

EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS TRAINING involves one instructor in each post-secondary vocational-technical school. These are YETP-paid persons. These instructors go to every high school to give "employability skills instruction" to ALL high school seniors.

Media Implementation Center is funded through our five percent Governor's discretionary money.

VOCATIONAL WORK STUDY is funded under YETP. Students are required to enroll in vocational work study courses. The program operates just like our regular vocational education work study program. Our regular vocational education instructors find the job slots for this program. We have moved about 50 YETP youth this year from PSE to unsubsidized jobs in the private sector through this program.

We have six SCHOOL COMMUNITY COORDINATORS paid for by YETP. They operate, in effect, a job placement service.

VOCATIONAL EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT is provided in a mobile unit funded by YETP to do vocational assessment for special education students. We also have an active 70001 program in Arkansas.

Questions and Answers

Q - How does 70001 operate?
A - It is an off-shoot from DECA which is now funded by CETA, primarily for out-of-school youth beyond the high school age range. 70001 is a way of making productive citizens out of some youth who might otherwise wind up being societal liabilities.

Q - Do you have "employability skills training" for ALL high school seniors using your Governor's "five percent funds"?
A - Yes, BUT the Department of Labor has now told us we should use these funds only for YETP-eligible youth. Right now, the salaries of instructors for this program are being paid by these "five percent funds," but we are going to pick up these salaries with State funds. We could operate this same program using YETP "transition services" funds and be perfectly okay. The trouble arose by using the set-aside linking funds from the Governor's discretionary funds.

Q - Does the Vocational Education Division of the Arkansas State Department of Education actually make the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements with local school districts?
A - Yes.

Q - How do your "school/community coordinators" operate?
A - We try to work through our Employment Service in placement. This is funded by YETP and serves all youth, not just "YETP-eligible youth."

Q - How close is your "career employment experiences" portion of YETP to your regular vocational education work-study program?
A - It is our work study program BUT limited to YETP-eligible youth and thus restricted to PSE work experience slots. We do make an attempt to move these YETP youth, when they are ready, into unsubsidized work experience slots in the private sector. But, of course, when we do so, the youth then are out of YETP.

Q - What is the key to moving YETP kids to unsubsidized jobs in the private sector?
A - Most of these YETP youth in vocational work-study are special education kids. They need the pre-experiences of PSE work experience before we can move them on to unsubsidized jobs in the private sector.

Q - How do you relate with your State Coordinator of Career Education?
A - Very closely.

Q - How many staff are paid for by YETP funds in your Arkansas program?

A - Somewhere between 50 and 60. Note that, except for three or four, the rest are paid for under "training costs," not under "administrative costs."

Linda Phelps and Ann Six - Frankfort, Kentucky

Linda (LEA representative)

We are in South Central Kentucky. There are about 10,000 people in our county with two incorporated towns. Jobs are primarily in farming and tourist businesses. We have only one major industry (715 employees) and three or four small factories (25-50 employees). Our unemployment rate varies between eight percent and 11 percent. The second largest employer in the county is the school system. Forty-two percent of our students are economically disadvantaged and YETP-eligible.

There are two persons in our LEA employed in YETP. One is a person who recruits and screens students, does community contact work leading to work sites, monitors youth at their work sites and follows up on YETP participants. The other YETP person is ME. As a half-time YETP counselor, I have weekly counseling sessions with youth, do testing, and provide things like career orientation.

We have 98 YETP slots in our LEA. At the beginning, we have orientation sessions for our YETP enrollees. We move from that to interest/ aptitude testing, and then on to job sampling in the community.

In our "job sampling work experience for YETP," each YETP youth can sample two or three jobs per year with job rotation occurring about once every eight weeks. We try to rotate these job sampling sites with the youth's career interests and, to date, have used such jobs as: (a) dairy farm aide, (b) TV techician, (c) auto mechanic helper, (d) accountant aide, (e) grocery clerk, (f) feed mixer assistant, (g) florist aide, (h) "bundle boy," (i) teacher aide, and (j) nurses' aide. We are now using 79 different host agencies.

We have had tremendous community response favorable to YETP. In our small community everyone knows everyone else, which helps considerably.

My weekly counseling sessions with YETP youth are all group work oriented and take place either during the student's study hall or after school. The counseling sessions consist of activities like role playing, job resume writing, etc.

Our most obvious success can be seen in the fact that 10 of our YETP youth are now in full-time employment and 17 now have part-time jobs in the private sector.

Ann (Prime Sponsor representative)

Basically, our CETA Balance of State covers 88 counties. All counties were invited to enter into LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements. Some could not qualify and some did not apply, but we now have LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements in force in 61 counties through our Balance of State CETA efforts. In-school projects account for 56 percent of the total FY 79 YETP expenditures.

We have gone through a period of assessment of all our 61 contractors and have found eight of them to be outstanding successes. Of these, seven are rural communities. We have had far better luck in getting involvement with private sector employers in rural areas than we have in urban areas.

YETP participants are telling me, "We like this YETP program because we are earning money in it; you are not giving it to us as a handout!" We have developed good relationships with LEAs by letting them know exactly what we, as a Prime Sponsor, want them to do. We like the JOB SAMPLING PROGRAM Linda described, and are asking all LEAs to do it next year. We are going to report on this at our State Career Education Conference in June.

As the Balance of State Prime Sponsor representative, I have technical assistance meetings with each of the 17 LEAs with which I am assigned to work. The LEAs can ask me about any CETA rules and regulations at any time. We have a very good working relationship and good communications channels established. The in-school projects are designed to complement the State and local career education programs.

Questions and Answers

Q - How does your private sector "job sampling work experience" arrangement work?
A - The LEA contacts the private employer, arranges for the work site, and places the student. The employer has to sign a form certifying that the work provided will be "career exploration." We pay the YETP enrollee wages for this because the experience is "training," not "employment."

Q - How does this "job sampling work experience" tie in to your school's vocational education program?
A - Many of our YETP enrollees are vocational education students. This "job sampling" takes place, by and large, during after-school hours.

Q - Does the Department of Education say that what you are doing is legal?
A - Yes. We have checked it out and obtained a Department of Labor ruling.

Q - Do you have trouble with organized labor on your paid work experience in the private sector?
A - No. Labor unions understand that we provide only career exploration -- i.e., that we are not taking jobs away from adults who would otherwise be employed.

Q - How are you doing in sex role stereotyping?
A - We are doing okay. For example, we have one girl in dairy farm work. That is only one of several examples we could give.

Stan Townsend and Cathy Ramirez - Casper, Wyoming

Stan (LEA representative)

I represent the LEA. The LEA provides the office space, secretarial support, and bookkeeping for our YETP project.

One of my roles is to find other resources within the LEA that will help make YETP work better. It is tough but I am doing it now, with the help of classroom teachers.

I teach for new YETP enrollees a two-week orientation course (which can, on an individualized "need to get" basis, be extended to 30 days). In this course, I teach job survival skills, self concept, job resumes, etc. Self concept is especially important because many of our YETP youth are parole referrals. We use the Teledyne system from Mountain Bell (donated free by the company), so that we can role-play telephone interviews.

We are housed in the same alternative education building as vocational evaluation, our GED adult education program, and our "English as a second language" program. We can refer our YETP youth to any or all of these in the morning and let them come to my class in the afternoon.

We give two tests, the Kuder Preference Record and the Career Maturity Inventory, on a "pre/post" basis to our YETP enrollees so we can measure progress from my orientation course.

Many of the YETP kids I get do not know the basic academic skills. I have received a lot of help from classroom teachers in setting up individual study sessions for some of these kids so they can acquire these basic skills. Some can get academic credit for acquiring such skills.

The group orientation sessions I conduct are good for these YETP enrollees. They get to talk to each other, to interact, and to build self concept and self-confidence.

Cathy (Prime Sponsor representative)

Because we are having trouble finding YETP-eligible youth in Casper, we get a lot of referrals from State agencies (like the parole board) of kids who, because of their "special needs" status, are automatically eligible for YETP. Because of this kind of enrollee population, our dropout rate is higher than would otherwise be the case.

We received a list of 250 high school dropouts from the LEA last year. It was the first time that people in the LEA had ever bothered to make such a list, and they did it for us when we asked them for it.

My role is to do recruitment, initial intake, contacting of possible work sites, monitoring and evaluation of YETP work sites, and followup. I also keep in close contact with other CETA programs such as vocational training, OJT, etc. Our roles (Stan's and mine) are interchangeable, and we often take the place of the other.

Our contract was written by the Casper LEA and SER. I work for SER (a community based organization) and Stan works for the LEA.

We tried doing YETP as "career exploration" (like Linda does in Kentucky), but we were not allowed by our Prime Sponsor to do it. As a result, we place our 23 YETP youth with nonprofit corporations. It is "career exploration," but there is no rotation of worksites involved.

There is a problem when we use private sector employers in that, at times, they fire the youth and neglect to tell us they have done so.

YETP is a year-round program in Casper. We do this by combining YETP with SYEP. By combining, we have fewer students in YETP during the school year and so can provide more individual help to each of those we do have.

SYEP is run by our local Employment Service office. The Employment Service works with us.

If we have a 16 or 17 year old youth with no vocational skills and no high school diploma who has actually dropped out of high school, we can ask for waivers from the SEA so that the youth can enroll in the GED program under CETA without having to go back to the high school; many such youth do not want to go back to high school anyway.

Questions and Answers

Q - How does the two-week orientation course work?
A - This course is going on periodically throughout the entire school year. I run one for two weeks and then, after placing the kids who were in it, we start up another. Kids get academic credit for this when combined with their work experience.

Q - Are you serving some non-YETP eligible youth?
A - Yes. Fifty percent of those we serve are non-YETP eligible. Our LEA certified to our Prime Sponsor the need to serve these youth. These kids receive the orientation course and counseling and are then placed in unsubsidized work experience slots in the private sector. We can and do monitor and evaluate their work site experiences, just as we do for income-eligible YETP youth.

Q - How many YETP enrollees do you have in a year?
A - Last year, we finished 35. In a typical orientation course, three to four YETP youth (some income-eligible and some not) are enrolled.

Concepcion Beltran and Lina Lucca - Hato Rey, Puerto Rico

Con (LEA representative)

The main goal of the Education Manpower Program in Puerto Rico is to assure the most effective achievement of the overall purposes of the CETA Program. We are trying to reform the school-to-work transition process through using our program to make a basic reform in our entire educational system. Our school system was formerly a "rice and beans" curriculum -- i.e., very little choice available. Through the reform made possible by YETP, we are able to offer students a broader set of choices. We really see YETP as an instrument of basic curriculum change.

We are trying to coordinate all CETA programs, at the State level, with the Department of Education, and with the State office of Federal Affairs (OFSCPD). Our YETP effort is being tied, as closely as possible, with both community education and career education.

We originally conceived our EMP program with five basic components: (a) administration, (b) general services (c) career transition, (d) central record unit, and (e) curriculum development.

Our administration component at the State level includes 51 persons to develop the Education Manpower Program in coordination with our six Prime Sponsors and the Balance of State. We, at the SEA level, assess and approve all applications and proposals. All Department of Labor youth programs are basically educational; thus, we feel our Prime Sponsors should relate to the school system. We dedicate our main efforts to enhancing their capacity for the development of youth programs.

Our general services component is divided into three basic units:

- General services provides equipment for the operation of our programs at all levels, and for our repair and maintenance units.
- The training unit includes six training specialists, each one assigned to an Educational Region. The six persons in this unit serve as liaison persons between the schools, various kinds of community resources, and CBOs. In each of our six regions, we try to assess student needs and interests and then match these with available resources. We have been trying to upgrade many of the things youth need but have not been provided in our existing educational program -- for example, personal hygiene, consumer education, conservation, use of money, taxation.
- Repair and maintenance units are used as resources for the LEAs to meet their own repair and maintenance needs on school buildings. It is meaningful work for the YETP enrollee and brings recognition from peers. Each YETP enrollee takes a two- to four-week orientation course prior to taking the repair and maintenance course.

Our career transition service component deals with all counselors in the SEAs. From our central office, we have a director and a staff of 14 persons for this component. We also have one coordinator assigned to each Education Region. This component aims to give youth a good orientation to the world of work, interest testing, employability plan, etc.

Our central record unit consists of detailed intake from the Prime Sponsor regarding YETP operations and transmittal back to the Prime Sponsor. It is a communications device between our State Department of Education and the Prime Sponsor, relaying data regarding what is actually taking place at the local level. This component has three persons assigned at the central level and one coordinator assigned to each one of the Education Regions.

Our curriculum development component is expected to influence change in the school curriculum. Through our counselors, vocational education teachers, and other professional LEA personnel, we are discovering the career needs of our YETP participants. We are also involving the community as an input source to identify needs leading toward curriculum revision. Although it only has two persons assigned at present at the central level, we hope to be able to complete this component by having the planned five members. We are working through our SEA regional directors in each of our six regions on this component.

We are holding community meetings to sell the notion of the need for basic curricular reform to community persons. It works better if we take the local superintendents and counselors with us to these community meetings. We are also trying to get private industry persons to join us in these community meetings and talk favorably about the need for a reform that emphasizes the school-to-work transition problems.

As a result of our first year of operation, CETA/SEA relationships have been improved. The improvement is seen in four areas: (a) we in the SEA have been holding meetings to listen to our six Prime Sponsors talk about their problems and concerns; (b) local schools are coming to our SEA office now, and we are better able to help them solve their local CETA problems; (c) development of YETP worksites has been improved throughout Puerto Rico; (d) we have grown from 6,000 to almost 12,000 YETP participants; and this summer we will have 60,000 youth in our SYEP program.

The "Transition Services Component" staff people in our SEA are working with our State Coordinator of Career Education. However, it must be remembered that career education, as a concept, was almost completely paralyzed this year due to lack of expected Federal funds.

FIVE ISSUES CHOSEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

- How to solve the funding cycle problems in making LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements.
- How to get more meaningful work experiences for YETP participants that go beyond menial jobs.
- How to reconcile education's emphasis on "mainstreaming" with YETP's emphasis on "segregating out economically disadvantaged."
- How to help Prime Sponsors understand how career education can be integrated into the YETP program.
- How to help educators learn what they need to know about CETA.

Issue: How to solve the funding cycle problems in making LEA/Prime Sponsor agreements

Maurey: This is severely limiting our short- and long-range planning. As an example, we are now planning our summer program but we cannot plan beyond that. For the last two years, we have been unable to start YETP until the second semester of each school year. We need to look forward to some continuity. In vocational education, we are required to do a five-year plan. Our planning for the vocational education budget for next year was done in January. It is difficult to employ staff or to get resources under the current arrangement. We need Congress to give us longer-term funding.

Chris: We operate a year-round program that combines SYEP, YETP, and CETA Title II-B into one integrated program. We found that we could use SYEP funds up through September, but we could not buy YETP materials until October.

Cathy: We cannot do that. We cannot use any YETP funds until youth are actually enrolled. When September 30 comes, we can keep the YETP kids we had left over on the rolls; but we cannot enroll any new ones until we get our new YETP money which, last year, came only in January.

Con: We have maintenance and repair units for students in vocational education who, apart from their vocational education classes, can take a short term course in repair and maintenance under YETP. We also put them with some non-vocational education students as YETP enrollees so they can learn from our vocational education students. Our big problem is funding, because enrollees cannot begin this work until the materials arrive, and the schools need their maintenance and repair work done now, too.

Chris: For the last five years, CETA has been asking us to plan in a six-week period. It is still doing this.

Maurey: We are trying to get over that problem now by planning a few things in advance and then, when the new CETA announcements come, we can fit our "ON THE SHELF" plans into them. That way, short "lead time" does not need to bother us. In Michigan, our Career Education Planning Districts (CEPD) and our YETP Youth Advisory Council are almost one and the same in terms of Advisory council members. At least this is true in our district. These kinds of groups could well engage in some of this "ON THE SHELF PLANNING" that would help us get over the planning problem.

Cathy: Counselors are helping kids plan their morning schedules early in the school year. They can schedule kids for classes in the morning and YETP work experience in the afternoon, in the hope that YETP funding will come through. When YETP funding is delayed, the counselors have to put these kids back in other kinds of classes, often ones that we know the kid would not successfully pass. As a result, counselors have to go back later to YETP and ask for alternative arrangements that will help keep the kid in school.

Ann: We are already finished with sending packets out to LEAs telling them what to expect in an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. This allows the LEA which had a successful agreement this year to pick up on YETP again when school starts (around August 15) and provides the LEA with funds to operate from then through September 30, with a clear expectation that new funding will become available on October 1.

Jim: We do the same kind of thing, but always with a clause in the new contract that says "depending on availability of funds."

Ann: LEAs know they need a new contract beginning October 1, but they have seen that in the past this has always happened. So it is really not too threatening to them when we use the "depending on availability of funds" kind of clause.

Linda: As one of those LEAs that Ann is talking about, we find this arrangement is working for us. We will terminate this year's "crop" of YETP enrollees on May 31 and pick them up again under our new "temporary" contract when school starts, knowing very well that we will need a still newer contract on October 1.

Maurey: If you terminate YETP kids in May, what happens to them during the summer?

Ann: Almost all of our YETP kids go on the SYEP rolls in the summer, but since SYEP is run by CETA Balance of State directly each summer, these kids must completely re-enroll in SYEP if they want to participate.

Maurey: It is very hard to find a person with good experience and background to take a job that could end any year on September 30.

Jim: DISAGREE. We have been in it for five years now. Most of our LEAs are finding qualified teachers for the Department of Labor youth programs who are even better than our regular teachers. We have not lost one in five years.

Stan: As one of the "temporary types," I do have to worry about whether I will have a job after September 30. It influences the effectiveness of the program when the YETP coordinators have to spend part of their time worrying about things like this.

Maurey: We have been trying to use YETP to implement a solid career development program which is really needed and which the LEA will want to keep going even if the YETP funds disappear. We have used our YETP funds to buy the hardware for this program, allowing the LEA to continue the program on its own at a very low cost. The only personnel demanded are part-time; that is not expensive. The inservice education required for this effort was obtained from our State Career Education funds, so it did not cost either the LEA or the CETA Prime Sponsor anything.

Con: The problem is how to recruit persons who have enough knowledge and experience to take these "soft" jobs, named on a transitional basis. We have been able to attract some from permanent "hard line" positions by simply paying more for the "soft money" jobs under a guarantee that, if our "soft money" jobs fold, they can go back to their permanent "hard line" positions.

Cathy: In effect, this is the same principle we follow, although it works differently for us. In Casper, the YETP "soft money" person is regarded by the LEA as a "substitute teacher." If YETP were to fold, he could go back to the LEA as a "substitute teacher" but would not, of course, be able to make as much money.

Issue: How to get more meaningful work experiences for YETP participants that go beyond menial jobs

Linda: Many of the YETP programs have had trouble moving beyond the old NYC concept of just "handy work" jobs for youth. We need to expand work experience opportunities in ways that will be oriented more around career exploration and tentative career choices of YETP enrollees.

Con: The source of this problem needs to be located. There are many counselors and teachers who use YETP only as a way of getting money to youth. Sometimes we see YETP youth in "work experience" only doing things like "mopping the floor." How long can a youth do this as true "career exploration"? Youth need to be well oriented and well supervised in YETP work experiences. The community, too, needs to understand that this is more than just another program to keep kids "occupied." Sound supervision is really important. A few weeks ago, we were debating this with our Employment Service to try to find ways to do YETP more like it should be done. We want to build a correct attitude toward work and toward all of life and living. This is what kids should get from YETP.

Maurey: We are very conscious of the career exploration emphasis in our vocational education program. We have not thought about it too much for YETP because, prior to this mini-conference, we were not thinking much about relating with the private sector. Another program we have had is our WALKABOUT program, which is aimed at career exploration in the community; we have not yet thought about this for YETP. I know of no place in Michigan where, as yet, YETP is conducted as true career exploration.

Ann: It is possible that, in Michigan, the Manpower Council would not approve private sector involvement for YETP.

Cathy: We cannot put kids in private sector work experience under YETP in Wyoming.

Jim: Even before YETP, we had work experience under CETA, but the Department of Labor was never able to really do it right. My concern is with what happens to YETP funds spent over and beyond the "22 percent" that goes to LEAs. I mean this especially in terms of supervision of work experience. My point is that, if work experience is done under the vocational education part of the LEA, we require certified vocational teachers as supervisors. Our problem, peculiar to Arkansas, is that we limit YETP participation to youth enrolled in vocational education. We can justify this on the grounds that there are more economically disadvantaged youth enrolled in vocational education than there are YETP funds to serve all youth.

Maurey: Exploratory work experience is certainly appropriate for 14-15 year olds. BUT, as the student becomes older, we ought to expect the work experience to include a *vocational training* emphasis in addition to the *career exploration* emphasis.

Cathy: Depending on the age of the youth, we try to develop good work attitudes among our younger students. As they get older, we try to relate the program more to career choices. For example, in jewelry making our goal is to help the youth decide if he/she has an interest and an aptitude for this, *not* to give the youth the specific vocational skills needed to become a jeweler.

Chris: YETP is *primarily* career exploration, but it is supplemented by a variety of kinds of other CETA programs (like Title II-B) aimed at giving youth specific vocational skills.

Maurey: We are trying to use YETP primarily for career exploration while, at the same time, combining YETP and adult CETA funds to operate our CAREER RESOURCE CENTERS that are designed to serve adults as well as youth.

Jim: We are operating some CAREER RESOURCE CENTERS too, but it is hard to get adults to use them if they are located in regular public high school settings.

Linda's program in Kentucky comes about as close to the YETP "ideal" as anything I have seen. We do about the same thing under our vocational education exemplary funds at the 10th grade level while using our YETP money in our work study program at the 11th and 12th grade levels.

Linda: It is true that, relatively speaking, more 12th graders have made career decisions and are more interested in preparing for their chosen careers than in continuing to explore other possibilities. BUT it is also true that many, many 12th graders are still very much in the career exploration stage and have no idea what kind of career they really want to pursue.

Maurey: If career education were to really begin early in the elementary school, perhaps kids could make career choices prior to entering the 11th grade. However, as things now stand, they have not. That is why our YETP effort is primarily "pre-vocational" and aimed at career exploration.

Jim: I would like to see YETP, as career exploration, used primarily for 15-16 year olds at the 9th and 10th grade levels. This would then let us do legitimate vocational education for 11th and 12th graders.

Stan: I would much prefer to work with 14-15 year olds in career awareness/exploration than with older kids. The biggest thing I find working with 16-17 year olds is boredom. It is even tougher with this age group than it is working on these same problems with youth 19-21 years old.

Ann: We have tried a VEP (Vocational Exploration Program) for 14-15 year olds during the summer that runs for a period of about four weeks. We have found a lot of these kids becoming really bored with it after the second or third day. They were being moved from one occupational area to another once a week and they still became bored. If they do something themselves, they like it; but if they just observe or shadow others at work, they become bored. As a result, we are not going to do a VEP program this summer with YETP funds.

Con: We in Puerto Rico got together with our Employment Service people and talked about the meaning of "meaningful work experience." We decided that, if it is going to be "meaningful," the youth needs to feel that he/she accomplishes something, whether or not he/she actually does. It must be something more than shadowing. That is basically why we thought about starting our repair and maintenance program in schools where we mix vocational education students with some vocational skills, who serve as tutors to other students who have the desire, but not the vocational skills required to do this repair and maintenance work. Granted, it IS productive work in that the youth actually do repair and maintenance jobs on the school buildings. We do not try to do this in San Juan where organized labor might object.

Jerry Gould: (NMI) In Portland, Oregon, programs are getting over the objection of organized labor by using AFL/CIO persons as tutors and advisors. The fact that kids there are doing productive work is not objected to by organized labor.

Maurey: I want to know how Linda resolved problems of employer liability when kids do YETP work experience in the private sector.

Linda: Workman's Compensation is paid by the CETA Prime Sponsor for any kind of work experience involving CETA funds.

Ann: AGREE. This is mandated in the CETA rules and regulations. However, we do not assume any responsibility for possible damage to equipment of the private sector employer. We tell the employer that we want the youth to have close supervision and that, if employers follow through on this, the equipment will not be damaged. We had one situation in which a supervisor went off and left two YETP kids alone. When one of them drove a tractor into a ditch and wrecked it, we refused to reimburse the employer. Next year, ALL our YETP youth will be required to have job sampling, so we will be using the private sector much more than we did this year.

Linda: Our career exploration work experience is meaningful to the kid; i.e., the YETP youth does feel he/she is being productive. The employer is not, however, looking for the kid to become so productive that he/she makes money for the employer. Instead, our employers who supervise these YETP youth really do feel they are participating in helping their career development. Part of the reason we have this kind of "let us all join together to help this kid learn how to work" attitude among our private sector employers is that we know them well, as members of the same small rural community. Our evaluation results show that employers typically say they work with us because they really want to help the youth, NOT because they hope to make money by doing so.

Cathy: When you are working with a high percentage of high school dropouts, as we are, you find that the big problem is getting these kids to have even an attitude that they should have some kind of goal. It is very hard just to get the kid to look positively at himself/herself, let alone think seriously about career choices.

Issue: How to reconcile education's emphasis on "mainstreaming" with YETP's emphasis on "segregating out economically disadvantaged"
(unlisted, emerged during discussion)

Jim: We can provide transition services under YETP as "mainstreaming," but we can do "career employment experiences" in YETP only through segregation.

Chris: There is pressure coming on YETP to take care of those kids who are not quite economically eligible but whose needs are just as great.

Cathy: We are charged, by our CETA contract, with getting kids out of the alternative school in which we work and back into the regular "mainstreamed" LEA setting. Even when we can talk one of these YETP kids into taking just one course back at a "regular" high school, we find we have some chance of talking him/her into going back into the "mainstreamed" LEA setting.

Issue: How to help Prime Sponsors understand how career education can be integrated into the YETP program

Ann: During this past year, we have been saying to our LEAs, "You need to have a good career education program if you are going to be successful in getting a YETP contract." BUT I kept saying this without knowing enough about career education. I do not understand how career education and YETP can be integrated.

Maurey: We have our local school district career education coordinators meet jointly to think and talk about extending the career education concept from kindergarten through the adult years. We invite Chris, as a Prime Sponsor representative, to these meetings. We often talk about how career education and YETP fit together. Our problem is extending this beyond YETP so as to include a number of other kinds of community agencies.

Chris: As a Prime Sponsor representative, I understand career education now to be a lifelong program beginning in elementary schools. I understand it is going to take a lot of different kinds of programs working together and a lot of different kinds of techniques. I see YETP as one forum for increasing the career education emphasis in our communities. I see YETP as a "component" of career education. BUT I could also think differently and view career education as one "component" of YETP.

Jim: The one percent Governor's linkage funds will be used in Arkansas, in part, for our vocational education media center. We could use part of these funds to link career education with YETP. The Department of Labor dictates how these funds are used. It is not up to those of us in education.

Marion: We are proposing to use the Governor's linking money to set up five career resource centers around the State, located either in community settings or in universities so that they can serve both youth and adults.

Ann: We are using our "linking" money to hire counselors to work with YETP participants so that they can get academic credit for their work experience.

Con: We think career education and YETP should be linked so as to avoid duplication of effort. We want to bring them together, not keep them as separate efforts. Our "Transition Services Unit" is now meeting with our SEA career education persons to see how we can better work together.

Jim: We have to avoid the internal "turf" problems among vocational education, career education, and guidance that are going on within education so we can join forces in a united education front in working with CETA Prime Sponsors.

Maurey: We have got to orient ourselves around kids. If we do, we will see vocational education as a part of career education. The career education concept is broad enough to be a linking vehicle for putting a work/education emphasis into both education and Department of Labor operations.

Issue: How to help educators learn what they need to know about CETA

Stan: It is understandable why educators do not want to learn about CETA. CETA is confusing and complicated when you try to understand it. I see many things in the YETP rules and regulations that could be done that we are not now able to do, primarily because those educators who made our LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement did not know enough about YETP to include some of those things in that agreement.

Con: We must also be willing to turn this question around and ask "HOW CAN CETA PEOPLE LEARN WHAT THEY NEED TO KNOW ABOUT EDUCATION?" Both questions are equally important. Schools need to be understood by CETA personnel in terms of the presence and the need for established standards in education.

Ann: We as Prime Sponsor representatives do not hand out the formal YETP rules and regulations to educators. Instead, we give them "guidelines" telling them what we expect from them in an LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement. At first, educators did not understand why we had such expectations, but now they seem to be understanding much better. As an example, they now seem to better understand why we insist that the LEA have an operating career education program if we are to fund it for YETP operations.

Stan: We need a system whereby teachers and counselors can have some input into writing the LEA/Prime Sponsor agreement and the operational understandings leading toward implementation of the agreement.

Ann: If an LEA wants to do something under YETP that is not in our standard agreement, it can call and ask us (the Prime Sponsor) if it is possible. Thus, LEAs *do*, in this way, have some input into the agreement itself.

Jim: I have seen some instances where the schools put in half of the money and YETP puts in half, under arrangements where the Department of Labor rules and regulations are followed half of the time only. The best examples are in Experience Based Career Education.

Right now, under YETP, LEAs are funded 100 percent for the first two years but only 75 percent for the third year of operation. It could keep going down to the point where vocational education funds (which come into play at about the 55 percent level) could, theoretically, pick it up and continue programs indefinitely if YETP funds were to just dry up altogether. Of course, under those circumstances, we would not be talking about paying kids either wages or allowances.

Chris: Problems will develop if you pay YETP youth for the same things that other kids are offered by the school without pay. To pay someone to take basic education which the school is offering to anyone who wants it anyway is not really right. We do people no favor if we pay them for everything they do to improve themselves.

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

Ms. Jean C. Abbott
Coordinator, C.E.E. Program
Aynor/Conway Career Center
Route 8, Box 343
Conway, South Carolina 29526

Mr. Ed Andrews
Assistant Operations Manager
Providence CETA Administration
40 Fountain Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Mr. Joe A. Baird
Postsecondary Occupational Program
Coordinator and Program Director
Public Service Occupations
Arizona Department of Education
Division of Special Program Services
1535 W. Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Mr. Robert W. Bassard
Work Experience/CETA Coordinator
Hacienda La Puente Unified School
District
15359 E. Proctor Avenue
City of Industry, California 91744

Mr. Concepcion Beltran
Administrator, EMP Program
Department of Education Office
Room #409
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00918

Mr. James T. Beshalske
CETA Youth Programs Supervisor
Toledo Area CETA Consortium
1222 Madison Avenue
Toledo, Ohio 43624

Dr. Raymond Lee Billingsley
Director, High School Improvement
Project
Newton County Comprehensive High
School
Route 2, Ram Drive
Covington, Georgia 30209

Mr. Ronald L. Bolam
Program Director
Allegheny Center
Suite 1300
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15252

Dr. Lee Bowen
Supervisor of Career Education
Prince George's County Public Schools
3940 Elm Street
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

Mr. Mark Bowlds
Chief
Youth Employment Programs Bureau
Employment and Training Division
Department of Labor and Industry
State Capitol
Helena, Montana 59601

Ms. Florence Brady
Counselor/Career Consultant
Haddon Township High School
Memorial Avenue
Westmont, New Jersey 08108

Ms. Barbara M. Branigan
Manpower Specialist I
Classroom Training and
YETP Coordinator
CETA Regional Office
1811 West Second Street, Suite 470
P.O. Box 1286
Grand Island, Nebraska 68801

Dr. Robert G. Brooks
Administrator
Adult, Career, and Vocational
Education
Providence School Department
86 Fourth Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02906

Mr. James D. Calder
Director, CETA/BOS
Nevada Employment Security
Department
500 E. Third Street
Carson City, Nevada 89713

Mr. John Carney
Administrative Assistant for Youth
Programs
Employment and Training Center
455 North Main Street - 12th Floor
City Hall
Wichita, Kansas 67202

Mr. George Chiotellis
Program Director/CETA
Department of Labor Resources
City of Savannah
P.O. Box 1027
6 Bay Street
Savannah, Georgia 31402

Mr. George A. Clanton
Acting Supervising Director
Community and Industrial Relations
Public Schools of the District of
Columbia
415 - 12th Street, N.W. - Room 904
Washington, D. C. 20004

Dr. Joseph T. Coleman, Jr.
Supervisor of Youth Programs
P.O. Box 13145
Roanoke, Virginia 24031

Ms. Cynthia Conwell
Project Director, Triple E
Education Collaborative for Greater
Boston
20 Kent Street
Brookline, Massachusetts 02146

Ms. Lisa Coon
Program Coordinator, YETP
Employment and Training Division
Balance of State CETA
5790 McCorkle Avenue
Charleston, West Virginia 25304

Mr. Sherman Crisden
Manpower Youth Planner
800 French Street
City-County Building, Seventh Floor
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Mr. Jay J. Czar
Manpower Planner
City of Albuquerque/Bernalillo Co.
302 Sixth Street, Northwest
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Mr. James Dasher
Supervisor, Exemplary Programs
State Department of Education
Capital Mall
Arkansas Department of Education
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Mr. C.C. Davis
Superintendent, Gadsden City Schools
501 South 12th Street
Post Office Box 184
Gadsden, Alabama 35902

Mr. George Degenhart
Project Director, Career Education
Springfield City Schools
49 East College Avenue, Box 89
Springfield, Ohio 45501

Mr. Joseph Nicholas Delgardo
Coordinator of Youth Employment
Boston Public Schools
26 Court Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02130

Mr. Peter D. Disley
YEDPA Coordinator
51 South Main Street
Janesville, Wisconsin 53545

Mr. Michael E. Druley
Project Director
Clinton County YETP Program
1 Meich Road
Frankfort, Indiana 46041

Ms. Ellen M. Earley
Site Coordinator-Career Planning
  Guidance Counselor
South Burlington High School
500 Dorset Street
South Burlington, Vermont 05401

Mr. Stan Eccles
Supervisor, In-School Programs
1811 Smith Tower Building
Seattle, Washington 98104

Mr. Harlan Edmunds
CETA Planner
Sacramento/Yolo CETA
2020 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Rita C. Fantin
Program Coordinator
Project JOBS
Montgomery County Public Schools
850 Hungerford Driv[illegible]
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Mr. Ronald T. Finnegan
Project Director
CYET
St. Paul Independent School
District #625
Baker School, 821 Raymond Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55114

Mr. Maurice Fritch
Vocational Director
St. Clair County Intermediate
School District
499 Range Road
POCS-1
Marysville, Michigan 48040

Mr. John Fitzsimmons
Youth Coordinator
Cumberland County CETA
107 Elm Street
Portland, Maine 04101

Mr. Francis J. Fruzen
Senior Principal
Beloit High School - Memorial Campus
1225 Fourth Street
Beloit, Wisconsin 53511

Ms. Bette Fulton
CETA Planner
Central Iowa Regional Association of
Local Governments (CIRALG)
104 E. Locust Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Mr. Richard L. Gabriel
Supervisor, Career, Industrial,
and Vocational Education
Des Moines Independent Community
Schools
1800 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50307

Ms. Peggy R. Glass
Contract Specialist
Employment and Training
Administration
202 Union - Fourth Floor
Memphis, Tennessee 38103

Mr. Gary Gortenburg
Youth Employment Coordinator
Urban Affairs Department
Employment and Training Division
City Hall, Fourth Floor
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Mr. Robert Griffith
Supervisor, YETP
West Virginia Department of Education
1900 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Dr. G. R. Gross
CETA Program Manager
Johnson/Leavenworth County Consortium
135 South Kansas Avenue
Olathe, Kansas 66061

Mr. Lawrence Growney
Assistant Director
Rockland County Manpower
11 New Hempstead Road
New City, New York 10956

Ms. Linda J. Guillerault
Title IV Project Coordinator
Newton Area CETA
320 Needham Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02164

Mr. Tim Haffner
YETP Coordinator
Scioto Training and Employment
Program
817 Second Street
Portsmouth, Ohio 45662

Mrs. Ann Hagestad
Operations Manager
1118 Red Fox Road
Arden Hills, Minnesota 55112

Ms. Linda S. Harvey
Assistant Director, Youth Program
Monitoring
Governor's Office, Job Development
and Training
P.O. Box 22802
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Mr. Craig Heninger
Planner
Weber County Office of Support
Services
Department of Employment and Training
Weber-Morgan CETA Consortium
Ogden, Utah 84403

Mr. James S. Hensley
Coordinator of Career Education
Edinburg Consolidated Independent
School District
P.O. Box 990
Edinburg, Texas 78539

MS. Mary Kay Hoff
Program Coordinator for State Board
and Technical Education/CETA
401 Illinois Building
17 W. Market Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dr. Harry C. Holmberg
CETA Youth Programs Manager
Office of the Los Angeles County
Superintendent of Schools
9300 E. Imperial Highway, Room 246
Downey, California 90242

Mr. John K. Horn
Program Coordinator for Diversified
Occupations
Orange County Public Schools
P. O. Box 271
Orlando, Florida 32802

Mr. Willie Horsely
Program Supervisor
Kansas City Public Schools
1211 McGee Street
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

Ms. Ana Maria Huerta
Youth Services Division Director
County of Hidalgo
Department of Community Affairs
P.O. Box 1166
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Mr. Bill Jackson
Supervisor Federal Employment and
Training
Waterford School District
6020 Lake Pontiac Road
Waterford, Michigan 48095

Ms. Frances Jackson
Director of Career Education
Great Falls Public Schools
3305 12th Avenue South
Great Falls, Montana 59405

Mrs. Wilma Jackson
Job Development Coordinator - YETP
Jackson Manpower Consortium
750 N. Congress Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39202

Ms. Jorja K. Jacobs
Career Education Coordinator
Education Services Coordinator
Tulsa Public Schools
P. O. Box 45208
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145

Dr. Thomas J. Jacobson
Director, Grants and Contracts/School Improvement
Grossmont Union High School District
Box 1043
1100 Murray Drive
La Mesa, California 92041

Mr. J. Ray Jarrett
Director of Vocational Education
Weber School District
1122 Washington Boulevard
Ogden, Utah 84404

Mr. Jerry Jenkins
Teacher/Coordinator
Scioto County Joint Vocational School
Box 766
Lucasville, Ohio 45648

Mr. Fred Kaufman
Superintendent of Schools
Program Director, CETA-YETP
Plattsmouth Community Schools
2101 S. 15th Street
Plattsmouth, Nebraska 68048

Mr. Greg Kazmierski
Youth Programs Supervisor
County of Oakland
140 S. Saginaw Street
Suite 725
Pontiac, Michigan 48085

Mr. Walter M. Kearney
Project Coordinator
Youth Employment Demonstration Project
Howard High School, Room 101
13th and Poplar Streets
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Ms. Sandra Kelly
Program Planner/Coordinator
Snohomish County Youth Work
  Experience Program
4730 Colby Avenue
Everett, Washington 98203

Mr. Joseph E. Kennedy
Manager of Youth Programs
Allegheny County Department
  of Jobpower
429 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Mr. Edward Killeen
Career Education Coordinator
Patrick F. Gavin Middle School
215 Dorchester Street
South Boston, Massachusetts 02127

Mr. Donald K. King
Planner Roanoke Consortium for
  Manpower Services
145 Campbell Avenue
Crystal Towers Building
Roanoke, Virginia 24011

Mr. Conway Knighton
Youth Coordinator
215 St. Louis Street
Suite 203
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70801

Ms. Esther Korin
Board of Cooperative Educational
  Services
61 Parrott Road
West Nyack, New York 10994

Ms. Audrey Lehman
Business and Education Coordinator
Madison Metropolitan School District
454 West Dayton Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53704

Ms. Dana B. Little
CETA Youth Programs Supervisor
205 West Main Street
Somerville, New Jersey 08876

Mr. L. L. Livingston
Director of Curriculum
Delta County Joint School District
  No. 50
765 2075 Road
Delta, Colorado 81416

Ms. Gaetha Lloyd
Administrator, Ada County Employment
and Training
5414 Morris Hill Road
Boise, Idaho 83704

Dr. Forestine L. London
Supervisor, Vocational Technical
Education and Guidance
Shelby County School System
160 South Hollywood Street
Memphis, Tennessee 38112

Ms. Virgelina Lucca
Director, Teachers Administration
Department of Education
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00918

Mr. Stephen M. Lynch
Assistant Director
Employment and Training Center
of Camden County (CETA)
120 Warwick Road
Stratford, New Jersey 08084

Mr. Alan Machtinger
CETA Planner Office of Personnel
14601 Main Street
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20870

Ms. Karen McDowell
Youth Employment and Training
Department of Education
400 W. King
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Mr. Albert R. McMahill
Manager of the Educational Services
Unit
Youth Services Department
Employment and Economic Policy
Administration
15 Beacon Street - Fourth Floor
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Ms. Trudy Chenell McNulty
Assistant Director of Transition
Services
South Portland School District
130 Wescott Road
South Portland, Maine 04106

Mr. Terry Mehail
CETA/YETP Project Counselor
Division of Curriculum and
Instruction
Milwaukee Public Schools
5225 W. Vliet Street, P.O. Drawer 10K
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Mr. Samuel W. Mendelson
Coordinator of Compensatory Programs
Somerville Public Schools -
Administrative Headquarters
51 West Cliff Street
Somerville, New Jersey 08876

Ms. Elaine E. Metzger
Director of Planning - CETA
The Jason Building
181 Middle Street - Room 203
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604

Mr. Wade M. Morrison
Director, CETA Skill Center
Adult and Vocational Department
Arlington Public Schools
Arlington, Virginia 22204

Ms. Gloria Murray
Career Education Consultant
Department of Public Instruction
State House - Room 229
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Mr. A. Durand Osborne
Guidance Counselor
Chesterton Senior High School
751 West Morgan Avenue
Chesterton, Indiana 46304

Mr. Don Parsons
Director, Vocational Education Project
Educational Services
P.O. Box 398
Flagstaff, Arizona 86002

Mr. Frank S. Parsons III
Director of YETP
Hinds-Rankin Consortium
Jackson Public Schools
750 North Congress Street
Jackson, Mississippi 39202

Ms. Jane Patterson
Staff Specialist - BOS/CETA
Colorado DOC and Employment
251 East 12th Avenue - Room 353
Denver, Colorado 80203

Ms. Nancy Perkey
CETA Interviewer
Tennessee Department of Employment
Security
P. O. Box 70
Tazewell, Tennessee 37879

Ms. Linda Phelps
School Counselor
Russell County Board of Education
South Main Street
Jamestown, Kentucky 42642

Dr. Geraldine H. Plumb
Coordinator of Federal Programs
The Independent School District
of Boise City
1207 Fort Street
Boise, Idaho 83702

Ms. Joan Podraza
YETP Youth Representative
Balance of State CETA
610 Miderson Bldg.
12 & O Streets
Lincoln, Nebraska 68501

Mr. Chris Polyhronos
St. Clair County Manpower Youth
Coordinator
511 Fort Street - CETA
Suite #531
Port Huron, Michigan 48060

Mrs. Barbara Preli
Director, Career Education
Jefferson County Schools
Brown Education Center, Room 508
Fourth and Broadway
Louisville, Kentucky 40059

Ms. Cathy Ramirez
YETP Coordinator
Service Employment and Redevelopment
(SEER)
Jobs for Progress
140 E. K Street
Casper, Wyoming 82601

Mr. Keith Ratliff
Clark County CETA Youth Administrator
Employment and Training Office
29 West Washington Street
Springfield, Ohio 45502

Mr. Tim Reagan
Deputy Director of Employment
and Training
Employment and Economic
Policy Administration (CETA)
15 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

Mr. Howard A. Ribble
8434 Avenue C, McCoy Annex
Building 126
Orlando, Florida 32809

Mr. Polo M. Rivera
Education Program Specialist
Adult Vocational Services
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Mr. Gordon Roff
Program Manager
Seattle Public Schools Work Training
Program
4416 Wallingford Avenue, North
Seattle, Washington 98109

Mr. Harold Rogovin
Assistant Principal
Wilbur Cross High School
161 Mitchell Drive
New Haven, Connecticut 06511

Mrs. Jama Roman
Career Development Supervisor
Toledo Public Schools
Manhattan Blvd. at Elm Street
Toledo, Ohio 43608

Ms. Frances Rosen
Career Education Coordinator
Sacramento City Unified School
District
P.O. Box 2271
Sacramento, California 95810

Mr. Marty Ruglis
Coordinator for Special Instructional
Programs
Rensselaer County Board of Cooperative
Educational Services
1550 Schuurman Road
Castleton-on-the-Hudson, New York 12033

Mr. James A. Schommer
Assoc. Metro. Executive Director
YMCA of Metropolitan Madison
711 Cottage Grove Road
Madison, Wisconsin 53716

Mr. John Sedey
Director of Vocational Education,
Pupil Personnel Services and
Alternative Programs
Mounds View Schools
2959 North Hamline Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55113

Ms. Jacqui L. Shoholm
City of St. Paul
Division of Manpower Programs
310 Cedar Street
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Mr. Bill Silva
Program Coordinator, Tourism/Hospitality
and Education/Day Care Programs
1420 Edith Road, Northeast
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

Ms. Ann K. Six
Assistant Youth Coordinator
CETA Youth Program
Bureau of Manpower Services
DHR Building - Second Floor West
275 E. Main Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40621

Ms. Joyce Stewart
Manpower Planning Division
200 Civic Center, Room 214
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103

Dr. Jerry Clay Stone
Superintendent
Iuka Special School District
Quitman Street
Iuka, Mississippi 38852

Mr. Robert Struble
Youth Program Planner
Human Resources Bureau
522 Southwest Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

Mr. William E. Studyvin
Supervisor, Practical Arts and
Vocational Education
Shawnee Mission - U.S.D. 512
7235 Antioch Road
Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66204

Ms. Janet L. Swift
Youth Programs Planner
Denver Employment & Training
Administration
1421 Elati Street
Denver, Colorado 80204

Mr. Thomas Thielman
Senior Manpower Program Coordinator
Rensselaer County Office Building
1600 Seventh Avenue
Troy, New York 12180

Mr. Stan Townsend
Education Coordinator
Roosevelt Center
Service Employment and Redevelopment
Jobs for Progress
140 E. K Street
Casper, Wyoming 82601

Mr. Victor K. Trice
Manpower Analyst
MSD Building - Third Floor
400 South Sixth Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202

Mr. Gary L. Tuck
Youth Employment Coordinator
City of Portland Schools
3830 Southeast 14th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97202

Ms. Bettye Tumlinson
Director, Youth Employment Service
Center (YES)
2629 East Central
Wichita, Kansas 67214

Mr. Leo A. Turner
Executive Director for the
Mayor's Office of Employment
and Training
222 St. Louis Street
Suite 330
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70801

Mr. Ernest Upthegrove
Consultant, Career Education
Division of Vocational & Adult
Education
Dade County Public Schools
1450 N.E. Second Avenue, Room 204
Miami, Fl 33132

Ms. Sandra J. Vallejo
Coordinator, Career Awarness Program
Oklahoma City Public Schools
900 N. Klein
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106

Mr. Edward Virant
Project Director - YETP
Grand Island Public Schools
805 W. Fourth Street
Grand Island, Nebraska 68801

Mr. David Wasson
Project Director
Mohave County Career Education
Project
5150 W. Beale
Kingman, Arizona 86401

Mr. Ron Wayman
Division Head - CETA
Planning and Contracting Division
315 North Hudson
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

Ms. Sandy Westby
Project Coordinator - YETP
West Fargo High School
109 Third Street East
West Fargo, North Dakota 58078

Mr. Grant Wickard
Manager, Youth Employment Training
Program
Denver Public Schools
900 Grant Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Mr. Gary Wilkening
Chief of Planning and Research
Sacramento/Yolo CETA
2020 J Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Ms. Ida T. Willis
Chief, Youth Programs Branch
Office of Employability Development
D.C. Department of Labor
605 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Mr. Maurice E. Wilson
Director, Manpower Development
and Training Programs (CETA)
1450 Northeast Second Avenue
Room 207
Miami, Florida 33132

Ms. Marilyn Wiltz
Vocational Counselor
Mukilteo School District
Mariner High School
200 120th Street, S.W.
Everett, Washington 98204

Mr. Walter Wolfe
Program Assistant YETP
Montgomery County Division of
Labor Services
8115 Fenton Street
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Mr. James Woodberry
Program Administrator, CETA Out-of-
School Programs
Vocational Education Center
240 Cedar Street
New Haven, Connecticut 06501